



THE
PRINCESS OF WALES
SARASVATI BHAVANA STUDIES

EDITED BY
GOPI NATHA KAVIRAJA

Vol. V.

Printed by Rameshwar Pathak, at the Tara Printing Works,
Benares and published under the authority of the Government
of the United Provinces by the Superintendent of the
Government Press, Allahabad.

GOVERNMENT SANSKRIT LIBRARY,
BENARES

1926.

CONTENTS.

Papers	Pages.
I. ANCIENT HOME OF THE ARYANS AND THEIR MIGRATION TO INDIA: By Atul Chandra Ganguly	1—11
II A SATRAP COIN: By Shyam Lal Mehr	13—18
III AN ESTIMATE OF THE CIVILISATION OF THE VĀNARAS AS DEPICTED IN THE RĀMĀYANA By Manmatha Nath Ray ..	19—78
IV. A COMPARISON OF THE CONTENTS OF THE RĠVEDA, VĀJASANEYI, TAITTIŘĪYA—, AND ATHARVAVEDA (CĪTURADHYĀYIKĀ) PRĀTISĀKHYAS: By Mangal Deva Shastri	75—114
V. DOCTRINE OF FORMAL TRAINING AND THE ANCIENT INDIAN THOUGHT: By G L Sinha	115—128
VI HISTORY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY OF NYĀYA VAIŚEŚIKA LITERATURE By Gopi Nath Kaviraj	129—192
VII. NOTES AND QUERIES By Gopi Nath Kaviraj . . .	193—195

I—ANCIENT HOME OF THE ARYANS AND THEIR MIGRATION TO INDIA

BY ATUL CHANDRA GANGULY

During the latter half of the last century the philologists inferred from philological and geographical reasons derived from the traditions preserved in the Avesta that the first ancestors of the Indians, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, and other European races speaking Aryan Languages were living together within the same enclosures, that the home of the Indo Germanic race is to be sought in the Central Highlands of Asia, and that after their invasion of India some three or four thousand years before Christ, one section of the race passed to Persia and the others directly from their original home went to Europe, and lastly that the ancient language of the Aryan conquerors of India was the oldest branch of that primal stock which in other regions and ages developed distinctive perfections in the utterance of Plato, of Virgil or of Shakespeare. The protest against the central Asian hypothesis was first raised by the modern geological archaeological and anthropological investigators. The first among the causes which have led to this protest is the discovery that the present races of Europe speaking Aryan languages have been inhabiting it since the beginning of the neo lithic period whose age according to M Morlot and others, may be from 8000 to 10 000 years. Their second objection is that those who now speak Aryan languages do not belong to one race, but to several. In the third place they hold that the most ancient records of any actual events which we possess are no longer the slabs with cuneiform writing disinterred from Babylonian mounds but the immeasurably older memorials of successful hunts, preserved

in the caverns of the Dordogoe, which were inscribed by the contemporaries of the mammoth on the bones and tusks of extinct animals, compared with which the records on Babylonian tablets, or in Egyptian tombs, much more the traditions preserved in the Avesta, are altogether modern. Last, they assert that in no part of Europe has it been proved that there was interruption of continuity between the ages of stone and metal, and there is no evidence whatever to show that the present inhabitants of Europe are not descended from the people of the Neolithic age, whose civilisation was of a very rudimentary character, and these conclusions, they say, which are now generally accepted by archaeologists, are fatal to the old theory that the Aryans were a comparatively civilised people, who invaded Europe from the East bringing with them bronze weapons which enabled them to subdue the aboriginal inhabitants of Europe. These discoveries have at once been followed by the abandonment of the Asiatic hypothesis by many eminent scholars who now advocate the European hypothesis.

Now, although many eminent scholars are in general agreement regarding these points, the inferences which they have drawn from the results of their investigations are so very conflicting that Dr. Smith has been led to write, 'The question of the original seat of the Aryan stock, one branch of which entered India, has given rise to many theories, which agree only in not being proved' (p. 26, *The Oxford Students History of India* 8th Edit.) Thus Topinard, a distinguished follower of Broca, remarks that it has been proved that the anthropological types in Europe have been continuous, and if the Aryans came from Asia they can have brought with them nothing but their language, their civilisation, and a knowledge of metals. Their blood has disappeared. The objection to this hypothesis has been

brought by others on the ground that there is no archaeological evidence for any such intrusive race. According to them one of the four European types, which may be traced continuously in occupation of their present seats to the neo lithic period, must represent the primitive Aryan stock. But the question can not be considered as determined, the French and German scholars being ranged in opposite camps. German scholars, notably Pesche, Penka, Hehu, and Lindenschmit, have contended that the physical type of the primitive Aryans was that of the North Germans—a tall, fair, blue eyed dolichocephalic race. French writers, on the other hand, such as Chavee, De Mortillet, and Ujfalvy, have maintained that the primitive Aryans were brachycephalic, and that the true Aryan type is represented by the Gauls' (p 226, *Origin of the Aryans*, Taylor). On the other hand, Prof William Ripley, the author of 'The Races of Europe', observes, 'The European races as a whole, show signs of a secondary or derived origin, certain characteristics, especially the texture of the hair, lead us to class them as intermediate between the extreme primary types of the Asiatic and the negro races respectively' (p 457). He concludes that after the partial occupation of Western Europe by a dolichocephalic Africanoid type in the stone age, an invasion by 'a broad headed race of decidedly Asiatic affinities took place. This intrusive element, he shows, is represented to day by the Alpine type of Central Europe.

In a word, although the existence of an Aryan race in Europe in early Neo lithic age is established, and, therefore, the theory of Aryan migrations from an Asiatic home in later post Glacial times is untenable, it does not prove that the Aryan race is autochthonous in Europe and the question of its original home cannot therefore be regarded as finally settled. The results of the recent investigations by Prof Arthur Keith that savagery has throughout been

co-existent with civilisation and that man has the human standard in size of brain by the commencement of the Pliocene period, have complicated the matter very much, and the problem has become all the more complex and difficult, because hitherto the investigations along this line have been carried on on the belief that savagery is civilisation in embryo and that a period of not more than some 80,000 years had elapsed since humanity was represented by a forest ape. When we know that even the higher humanity is at least 400,000 years old, and that the supposed identity of prehistory among savage races is as remote from the truth as the notion that the earth is flat, we can no longer accept primitive implements of savagery as proof positive of the state of civilisation at their supposed epoch, because the implements of 'primitive' culture are much more durable than any monument that civilised man is likely to leave behind him. Celts and arrow heads may survive their makers for hundreds of thousands of years, but it would be difficult to name a single article of modern manufacture which could long withstand the vicissitudes of flood and fire. If then the earth was really inhabited, as for example during Pliocene Age, by beings of higher mentality than any extant savage, the mere absence of material relics would not warrant the inference that they were uncivilised. Even the archaeological investigations have shown the probability of the overlapping of the ages of bronze and stone. The tombs which contain bronze weapons of archaic forms not infrequently contain stone weapons as well (p. 128, *Origin of the Aryans*, Taylor).

Some scholars lay too much stress on the results derived from a study of the science of linguistic palaeontology. They have tried to show that the undivided Aryans were a neo lithic people, in the pastoral rather than the agricultural stage, and were herdsmen rather than shepherds, simply because a large

number of words common to every branch of Aryan speech refer to the cow, the terms relating to agriculture, weapons, metals, and religion having as a rule, a more limited range. How fruitless are such attempts, and how extremely shadowy are their arguments and conclusions will be evident from a careful study of the Rgveda which has been written by the Aryans immediately after their separation from the original stock recording the events which soon followed their separation, which, according to these scholars, is a production of a childlike brain. Now the fact which needs recognition is that every kind of evidence must be considered on its true merits, but instead of that we twist and distort it so as to fit it into a pre-ordained scheme. In order that we may discover the true history of so remote a period as the expansion of the Aryans, all the apparently conflicting evidences which are beyond the shadow of a doubt are to be collected and examined on their true merits and co-ordinated and harmonised into one whole in the light of some authentic written record which will be able to explain all these conflicting evidences. Unless this is done, no conclusion can really be reliable and there will be room always for difference of opinion regarding many points.

The study of ancient monuments writes Dr Das, the author of 'Rgvedic India', 'undoubtedly furnishes more or less reliable data for the construction of ancient history, but ancient records either on stones or papyrus or by means committed to memory and handed down from generation to generation without the loss of even a single syllable, if such really exist would without doubt be a better and surer source of reliable history. The ancient Egyptians had their records in hieroglyphic writing as found on the famous Rosetta stone, and on walls and monuments, and on papyrus scrolls, inscribed in the hieratic character, which was a much modified cursive form of hieroglyphic simplified in the interest

of rapid writing' These records have furnished antiquarians with abundant materials for writing a correct history of ancient Egypt In Babylonia and Assyria, the records were inscribed either on stones or clay bricks that were afterwards baked These brick tablets which once formed the library of the Assyrian King Asshurabanapal at Ninevah have been found in large numbers, and carefully assorted and interpreted by Assyriologists They have furnished reliable materials for writing a succinct history of ancient Mesopotamia" (pp 4 5) But the Egyptian records in hieroglyphic writing and the Babylonian brick tablets may take us back for seven or eight thousand years at the outside, and will not, therefore, help us at all in examining, co ordinating and harmonizing the conflicting results drawn from the evidences supplied by the sciences of Archaeology, Geology and Anthropology, compared with which these written records are altogether modern For this purpose immeasurably older written memorials are needed, and such authentic (and immeasurably older) written records are as we shall show presently, supplied by the so called hymns of the Vedas, especially the Rgveda

'In India', as has been observed by Dr Das, 'no records either on stones clay bricks, or papyrus of the same age as the Egyptian and Mesopotamian records, have anywhere been discovered But the most ancient record of the Indo Aryan culture is to be found in the sacred Scripture, called the Rgveda Samhita The hymns, however, were not committed to writing on papyrus, palm leaves, or baked clay bricks, but to human memory carefully cultivated for the purpose, and were handed down from generation to generation without the loss of even a single word or syllable The ancient Indo Aryans probably thought this to be the surer and better method of preserving them from perishing in a world where everything either stone, brick or papyrus

perishes, excepting the human mind and soul. And herein probably lies the fundamental difference unfortunately overlooked by the European scholars, between the spirits of pure Aryan and pure Semitic or Turanian civilisation. This intuition on the part of the ancient Indo-Aryas, of the superiority of mind and spirit over matter very probably accounts for the absence of any material proofs of their antiquity, which can directly appeal to an ordinary observer or antiquarian. The proofs they have left are altogether of a different kind, which can only be correctly read by those who are endowed with a far greater amount of patience, diligence, perseverance, and capacity for taking pains than is required to deciphering a clay tablet or a stone slab, and in fixing the age of a broken statue, or a stone monument. It is because these proofs do not appeal to the senses that they have not hitherto received that amount of attention which they eminently deserve. Even those who, by dint of their wonderful diligence and perseverance were able to master it, could not always get at the real spirit underlying the hymns, probably through bias, prejudice and preconceived ideas, with which they started their study and enquiry. These have, in many instances, blinded them to the real import of passages which, read in the light of modern scientific knowledge in the domains of Geology, Archaeology and Ethnology, could have put them on the right track, and led them to the discovery of great historical truths' (pp 5, 6, Ibid).

The perusal of the first few chapters only of the work of Dr Das will show how immeasurably old are the memorials preserved by the Vedic Rsis in their sacred verses known as the Rks in which have been preserved the records of an age when there was a different distribution of land and water. Subsequently, we shall show that all the evidences point to a period of time, which most undoubtedly

be placed, geologically speaking, before the close of the Pleistocene era. We shall now confine ourselves to the task of examining what the Vedas, especially the Rgveda, have to say regarding the 'Ancient home' of the Aryans, and examine them and bring into their proper relations the apparently conflicting results arrived at by the archaeological, geological and anthropological investigators in the light of these records.

Now we cannot pass on to our task without noticing a recent work on Rgvedic India published by the Calcutta University, from which we have already quoted. The subject matter of the book is that the original cradle of the Aryans was the Punjab (the Sapta Sindhu, as it used to be called in Rgvedic times), which included Kashmere on the north and Gandhara on the west. In Rgvedic times the southern boundary, according to the learned author, was the Rajputna sea and the eastern boundary the Eastern sea covering the Gangetic trough. The author has tried to show that 'the Aryans were autochthonous in the Punjab, or at any rate had been living in the country from time immemorial,' and that their immigration, therefore, from central Asia, Northern Europe, or the Arctic region, is very improbable. He has given further shock to the western scholars by requesting them to carry the development of human civilisation in India back to hundreds of millenniums. He has arrived at his result from his own novel interpretation of certain references in the Rgveda which, according to him, can only be understood in the light of the results of modern geological investigations. Although there is some definite suggestion that the southern part of the Rajasthan desert was a very shallow sea in ancient times there is absolutely nothing in historical tradition to support the conditions conjectured by Dr Abinash Chandra Das (msp at p 90), and the whole of tradition negatives them.

The most precious legacy which Dr Das has handed up to us is, however, the line of research he has adopted in his book, which, if properly worked out, will yield valuable historical truths. He has inaugurated the method of finding out historical truths from the Veda read in the light thrown by the results of modern geological investigations, although here he has received some valuable hints from Mr Pavgee's works, 'Aryavartic Home' and 'Vedic Fathers of Geology'. He has even adopted some of the interpretations of the Vedic hymns offered by Mr Pavgee.

We shall now see how Dr Das has summed up his arguments from internal references in the Rgveda, and then examine them critically to see how far these go to prove that the Aryans were autochthonous in the Punjab, the oldest life producing region in India, and that they did not settle there as colonists from any other country. The author has summed up his arguments thus: (1) There were four seas round about Sapta Sindhu, a fact which is confirmed by geological evidences, (2) the region was peopled by the Aryans from time immemorial, and they came to regard it as their original home, —none of the Sanskrit books contain any reference to the foreign origin of the Aryans, (3) the region between the Indus and Sarasvati was regarded as the god fashioned land, the land in which the Aryans were born again and again, and it is significant as pointing to the belief of the ancient Aryans that they were autochthonous in Sapta Sindhu, (4) the region of Ilā, which was as old as that of the Sarasvati, was situated high up in the Himālaya, probably in Kashmere, and was the country where Dakṣa Prajāpati and Manu lived, (5) Indra was one of the oldest gods of the Aryans, to whom were ascribed the volcanic actions resulting in the tossing up of mountains, the depression of high lands and carving out of paths for the Indus in other rivers, which carry us back to the beginning of

human life on this globe', (6) it was in Sapta Sindhu that the first great exploits of Indra viz, the killing of Vṛtra, was performed, (7) the total absence of the mention of deluge in the Rgveda proves the period of the composition of the hymns to be anterior to that event', (8) the soma sacrifice was the oldest sacrifice among the Aryans, and the genuine Soma plant grew nowhere else excepting the Himalayas, and (9) fire was first kindled in the region of the Sarasvatī 'All these evidences, says the author, 'unmistakably point to the vast antiquity of the Rgveda and of Sapta Sindhu, and go to prove that the Aryans were autochthonous in the Punjab'

Although there were in ancient Rgvedic times, four seas, as we shall show later on, round about the region known to the ancient Aryans as Āryavarta, he has not produced sufficient evidences to prove conclusively that there were four seas round about the region of Sapta Sindhu. The mere mention of four seas in Rks, I 33 6 and X 47 2 does not establish his theory that the four seas mentioned in the Rgveda were respectively the large Asiatic Mediterranean sea extending from the province of Balkh to the heart of Siberia and from the confines of Mongolia to the Black sea, on the north the Eastern sea covering the Gangetic trough on the east, the Rajputana sea on the South and the Arabian sea on the west. Moreover the existence of the four seas round about the region in which the Aryans lived does not prove that the Aryans were autochthonous in the country, and that they did not settle there as colonists from any other land, it can only point to the period of time when those Aryans lived in that region.

While examining his next point of argument we shall try to establish our theory that the Indo Aryans were colonists from a country the mention of whose name has distinctly been made in the Rveda and that it contains

distinct reminiscences of the life of the Aryans in that country. His next point of argument is that none of the old Sanskrit books contain any definite reference or allusion to the foreign origin of the ancient Indo Aryans, because, the author argues, the region had been inhabited by them from time immemorial and they came to regard Sapta Sindhu as their original cradle. Here Dr. Das, to support his view, has cited the authority of the eminent Sanskrit scholar Muir, as if Muir cannot err. This statement of Dr. Das and others goes direct against everything of which we find mention in our oldest books. This he has supported by the argument that as the Aryans regarded Brahmāvarta as the Deva created land, the land in which the Aryans were born again and again, it is significant as pointing to the belief of the ancient Aryans that they were not colonists from any other country. There is definite mention of the Ancient Home or dwelling place of the Aryans in the Rgveda. Thus in Rk, I 30 9, we find mention of 'pratnasya oṣasaḥ', which undoubtedly means 'Ancient Home' (puratanasya oivasasthanasya, Sāyana and Ramānatha). Sāyana has also pointed, following no doubt the footsteps of the traditional school, that this 'pratnasya oṣasaḥ' refers to Svarga, the Home of the Devas. "Amu pratnasya oṣasya huve tuvi pratim naram yam te pūrvam pitṛ huve. Translated this would mean, 'My father sang before in praise of you who are the protector and lord of the 'Ancient Home now I also do the same.' This 'Ancient Home' was the abode of the Devas and the original abode of the composer of the Rgvedic hymns. Hence it follows that Svarga (Dyau or Ill) is our original abode. This statement is supported by the Rk, I 164, 33, in which definite mention has been made that 'Dyau is our fatherland (pitṛ), our birth place (janitṛ) and our original birthplace (nabhi=utpattisthānam, Sāyana. Vide his comments on Rk, X, 10 4)'.

II A SATRAP COIN

BY SHYAM LAL MEHR

INTRODUCTION

The coin was found in a small village in the Vyapur Taluka of the Baroda State. The find place is quite near Ahmadabad.

The coin no doubt belongs to some one of the Ksatrapa rulers of Malwa—Kathinwar, as the bust of the prince on the obverse with the date, though rubbed out, and a Stupa like emblem with a wavy line below and the crescent at the top on the reverse, clearly point out. The face, head dress, and the long hair of the King resemble those found on the Ksatrapa coins found and identified before.

The front portion of the King's bust appears to have been broken, and the legend on the obverse and a portion of it on the reverse have been rubbed out of existence on account of its brisk circulation.

PALAEOGRAPHICAL NOTES

The Script of the legend is Brahmi, and most of the letters on the reverse can be read with ease. They are —

“(क्ष) (त्र) प स र द्र स (ह) पु त स रा दो (म) (हा) (क्ष) (त्र)”

Now, excepting seven letters the rest are clear. The first two and the last four have been guessed from what has been spared to us of the original letters from the ravages of time. The lower portion of the letters affords us the greatest help in surmising what particular letters there were in those places. But there is some difficulty in deciphering the third and the fourth letters from the last. Any casual observer may hurriedly combine them with the lower curve

of the following (क्ष), and jump to the conclusion that there are no such letters as (म) (हा), but it is only one word, viz, (क्ष). But when the letters are carefully examined, it would appear that all those three letters are disjoined. Between the lower point on the right side of the fourth letter, and the remaining curves of (हा) and (क्ष) there is some space which clearly indicates that they are all separate letters. Thus it can be safely assumed that the last four letters are (म) (हा) (क्ष) (ञ). But there is one letter left which requires some attention. It is the eighth letter from the beginning, viz, (ह). At the first sight this appears to be न, and people can hastily conclude that the coin belongs to the 'son of Rudrasena'. But on a critical examination of the letter, it becomes evident that the curve at the end of the letter is on the right side, like ह, and is not rounded on the left side which is usually found in the न of those times (Cf 'The Palaeography of India' by R. B. Gaurishanker Ojha, plate X). By comparing even the same letter, i. e., (ह), with those found in the inscriptions of various Ksatrapa kings, both earlier and later, it becomes quite clear that a slight curve on the right side was an essential feature of ह, and that on the left side a sure accompaniment of न (e. g. in Rudradama's Gurnar Inscription shapes of न and ह and in later Ksatrapas also). Even by comparing this letter with न found in the names of various princes bearing the designation of Rudrasena, we find that it does not resemble them, and hence we are naturally forced to read it as ह. Thus it is clear that the coin belongs not to the 'son of Rudrasena', but to that of Rudrasinha.

Coming to the general nature of the letters, we find that they do not possess any of the characteristics of those found on the coins of the earlier Ksatrapas. That archaic tendency of letters is missing too. The figure of the Chaitya

which was made of round curves in the earlier coins does not appear in the coin under discussion. In it the Chaitya has been represented merely as a triangle and the moon by a very small line. This too points out that the coin belongs to some later Ksatrapa.

The letters are proportionate, clear and well-embossed.

IDENTIFICATION

Now, it remains to be determined as to which prince this coin belongs. There were three famous Ksatrapa kings, each of whom had some Rudrasimha for his father—

(1) Rudra Sena I, son of Rudra Simha I.

A. D. 199—222

(2) Dama Sena, son of Rudra Simha I.

A. D. 223—236

(3) Yasodaman II, son of Rudra Simha II

A. D. 317—332

(1) Let us compare the coins of Rudra Sena I (Rapson's Catalogue, plate XII) with the coin under discussion. The characters of Rudra Sena's coins, though Brāhmi in script, are more archaic. The crescent and the chaitya are more regularly circular. Moreover the face of Rudra Sena does not resemble that of the prince of our coin.

(2) Dama Sena's coin also does not resemble the present coin, and the reasons are mostly the same as mentioned above.

(3) The coins of Yasodaman II betray many similarities. The letters resemble, the stamping devices correspond, and even the two faces betray similar facial characteristics, and I first had come to the conclusion that the present coin belonged to Rudra Simha II's son, Yasodaman II. But later on I found that I was mistaken, and the error had resulted from my incorrect reading of the last four letters. When

after careful consideration I discovered my mistake and came to believe in the present reading, I found it difficult to attribute this coin to Yasodaman II, who was never a Mahaksatrapa while the present coin was issued by a prince who appears to have been a Mahak atrapa

Who was this king who resembled Yasodaman so much and whose coin also resembled those of Yasodaman ? The only difference between them was that the former appears to have been styled Mahaksatrapa while the latter was designated merely as K atrapa We hear of one prince, named Svami Rudradaman II who came immediately after Yasodaman II, and was the first Mahaksatrapa since the time of Bhartrdaman ' His reign , according to Rapson, "must fall somewhere in the period between the years 327 A D and 358 A D Unluckily no coin or inscription belonging to this prince has been brought to light, with which the present coin can be compared But the fact that Svami Rudradaman II came soon after Yasodaman II comes to our help in establishing the identity of the prince of the coin under consideration

A coin which greatly resembles those of Yasodaman II must be of a prince who might have flourished about his time, and there is no harm if a conjecture be hazarded that Svami Rudradaman II was the prince who issued this coin, and if this conjecture is believed the difficulty about his parentage is removed and a fresh light is thrown on his domestic relations revealing him to be a son of Rudra Simha II and a brother of Yasodaman II

SVAMI RUDRA DAMAN

After the troublous times were over and Ksatrapas Rudra Simha II and Yasodaman II restored peace and order in their kingdom Svami Rudradaman, presumably a son

of Rudra Simha II came to the throne and augmented the limits of his territories and assumed the title of Mahāk-
atrapa

Svāmi Rudradaman II appears to have possessed long hair, big ear lobes and prominent moustaches. His eyes were bright his forehead projecting and his nose not unfairly small. From his face he appears to be stout, with a character easily swayed by emotions. Though no vigorousness shines out from his face, yet it reflects some of the sterling qualities of his race—humorous disposition, bravery, and good nature.

GENERAL REMARKS

There is a general belief that soon after Mahāk-atrapa Bhartṛdaman, the Satraps had to face some foreign invasion, and in some of their remote provinces and chiefly Gujerat, their authority was weakened. But no convincing evidences are produced for this theory. Only because two of the princes of the new family did not use the title of Mahāk-atrapa, Rapson and others have thrown out the conjecture that they were attacked by foreign invaders and that their authority was not recognised in distant provinces. Troubles there might have been at that time for it is very natural that when one family supplants another, it is not usually by persuasion, but by the force of arms. The two Satraps of the new line viz, Rudrasimha II and Yaśodaman II were engrossed in the consolidation of their power and as a strong opposition was offered to them they did not feel themselves confident to assume the supreme title of Mahāk-atrapa and were content to be called mere K-atrapas. After them, when Svāmi Rudradaman II took the reins of government in his hands, the opposition was crushed and the position of the new family became secure, and Svāmi Rudradaman took the title of Mahāk-atrapa. Thus we find that the idea of a struggle between two sections of the

same family, followed by the necessary commotion in the country, is more probable, and quite in accordance with numismatic evidences

III. AN ESTIMATE OF THE CIVILISATION OF THE VĀNARAS AS DEPICTED IN THE RĀMAYANA.

BY MANMATHA NATH ROY.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The following paper from the pen of Mr. Manmatha Nath Roy, M.A., is an interesting contribution on the study of an aspect of the cultural history of ancient India. The paper is based on the Rāmāyana and deals with the civilisation of Vānaras, whom the writer identifies against the views of many with the Vratya Aryas rather than Dravīḍas or aborigines. His second paper, to be published in the following pages shortly, is a similar attempt based on similar data to treat the history of the Rakṣasas. It is needless to add that no study of ancient Indian culture can claim to be complete unless it takes note of the different elements of Indian People. The writer has been laboriously working as a Research Scholar for over two years in the Research Library, attached to the Govt Sanskrit College, Sarasvatī Bhavana, Benares. He has prepared a complete descriptive Index, almost cyclopaedic in its range and thoroughness, with a synoptic analysis of the contents, of the Rāmāyana, arranging all the information available in the book under certain leading words. He has been doing the same work with all the Mahāpurāṇas and Upapurāṇas. It is an arduous task, taxing the patience and energy of a diligent worker, but when completed, as I hope it will be within a couple of years more, it

will mark a brilliant achievement in the field of Indian Scholarship I can only hope that the work will be carried through The paper on the "Vānaras" just published is a specimen of the Rāmāyanic Studies

Sanskrit College,
Benares

G N KAVIRAJ

* * * *

The word civilisation is a relative term, and as such it does not stand by itself On the other hand it is closely connected with many things that vitally affect the well being of a certain people Again, it is never static in sense, it does not denote a *status quo*, it never signifies complete and absolute rest On the other hand, it is dynamic by nature, it is replete with the thrill of life, it connotes continuous motion of a certain people from one stage to another in a vain struggle to reach the ideal, the outlines of which, though vague and hazy ultimately seek to elevate the individual self through the well being of all the members

And it is this goal towards which each and every society, however crude moves slowly, and it is the consciousness of this goal, however dim it may be and however vague its ultimate realisation, that together with the reminiscences of a brilliant past, give an external binding to the members of that society, which goes by the name of social organisation In a savage society nobody respects the rights of his neighbour There might is right But as it advances through the process of evolution, the idea slowly dawns in the mind of some its members who try to communicate it to the slowly understanding, dumb masses These men are known to history as the pioneers of civilisation Thus civilisation may be defined as the process by which each and every member of a particular society tries to elevate his individual self with the active help and co operation of his neighbours Then, as it advances, it comes to include the whole humanity, for the term is never static in sense

If it is so, then why should the subject matter of the present paper make men laugh in their sleeves? For were not the Vānaras of the Rāmāyana as good breathing and feeling beings as we are? Had they not a glorious past to boast of? Had they not a peculiar social organisation of their own, and a peculiar culture which was all their own? It is just possible that their civilisation may be found wanting in certain respects when compared to those of the Aryas of the Madhya Desa and the Rākshasas of Lanka, yet there could be no denial of the fact that it was a civilisation—grand in its simplicity.)

At the outset it must be told that Vālmiki, the reputed author of the Rāmāyana, tried to present these Vānaras as semi-divine beings, who had graced this vile earth with the sole object of helping Rama to bring about the destruction of Ravana and his despicable accomplices who had for a very long time been terrorising over the innocent Rsis and Munis, who acted as the standard bearers of the civilisation of the Aryans in the distant and till then unexplored regions of Dakṣiṇapatha. We are told that "when Viṣṇu had taken his birth as a son of Dharma, Brahman asked the assembled Devas to produce Vānara children on the leading and reputed Apsarās, Gandharīs, Yakṣa and Naga girls, the bears (भृक्ष), Vidyadhars and Kinnars, and on the foremost of the Vānara ladies, so that they might give adequate help to this well-wisher Viṣṇu. In this connection these Vānaras are said to have been strong, assuming forms at will, proficient in performing miracles, brave, swift like Viṣṇu, indestructible, resourceful, possessing divine forms and knowing the use of all weapons like the nectar-consuming gods. (1. 17. 1—6)*

* Unless otherwise mentioned, the references are to the Rāmāyana (Bombay Edition).

Then we are told how Brahman produced Jāmbavāna, the chief of the bears, from a yawn, and how in accordance with the expressed desire of Brahman, the Devas, the high-souled Rṣis, the Siddhas, the Vidyadhars, the Nāgas and the Cāranas—all proceeded to produce Vanara children. Of these we are told that Indra produced Vālin, Sūrya produced Sugrīva, Vṛhaspati Tārā, Kuvera Gandhamādaa, Viśvakarma Nala, Agni Nila, the Aśvin twins Maṇḍa and Dvidā, Varuna produced Suśena, Parjanya Śamva, Maruta Hanumān, and so on (1 17 7—17)

Further on we are told "that on this occasion full one Kror of Vanaras were produced by various agencies—Vanaras, who could assume forms and increase their strength at will and could move about without any restriction, approaching lions and tigers in the fields of strength and pride, well-versed in the use of all arms, who fought with huge stones and hillocks tooth and nail, powerful enough to displace mountains, uproot steady trees produce agitation in the bosom of the ocean, tear open the earth with their feet, swim across the seas, soar through the sky, hold (the flow of) water, capture the elephant roaming freely in the forests and bring down the winged beings by their cries" (1 17 24—29)

Enough has been said above in support of the fact that what Vālmiki really intended was to present these Vānaras as semi-divine beings. But underneath this seeming finery and trimmery there flashes forth, here and there, the crude flesh of the frail earthly being. And it may not be out of place to mention here that the aim of the present paper is to deal exactly with the kind of life led by the Vanaras of the Rāmāyaṇic Age. We are not out to day to study the physiognomy of these much-condemned creatures, nor will we try to give an accurate measurement of the length of their tails.

Though not belonging directly to the field of our present enquiry, I introduce the present topic simply because it would furnish an interesting reading. Again it is only common sense that prompts me to describe what our heroes exactly looked like, before proceeding to describe how they lived. In so doing I shall play the painter who with a few careless strokes of his brush produces a finished picture.

We are repeatedly told that the Vānaras were कामरूपिणः (I. 17, 18, IV. 19-10), that is, they could assume various forms at will, सुदंष्ट्राः सम्पन्नवल्गुशालिनः (IV. 26-4), having well set teeth and magdety. रोमहर्षणाः गिरिकुञ्जरमेघाभाः (IV. 31-2-3) looking like elephants as big as mountains and clouds, they made the hair stand on the end. In another connection we are told—

नखदंष्ट्रायुधा सर्वे धीरा विरुतदर्शनाः ।
सर्वे शार्ङ्गलक्ष्मणाश्च सर्वे विरुतदर्शनाः ॥
दशनागवलाः केचित्त्रैचिद्दशगुणोत्तराः ।
केचिन्नागसदृसस्य वभूयुस्तुत्ययर्चसाः ॥

(IV. 31-24—25)

The heroes having teeth and nails for their weapons presented a hideous appearance. All were furnished with teeth (sharp) like those of the tiger, hence terrific-looking. Some were in possession of the strength of ten elephants, some equalled a hundred elephants, while others were more than a match for a thousand.

Again in connection with the description of Sugriva's palace, we are told that it abounded with

देवगन्धर्वपुत्रैश्च दानवैः कामरूपिभिः ।
दिव्यमालाम्बरधरैः शोभितां प्रियदर्शने ॥

(IV. 33. 6)

noble looking Vānaras, all descended from the loins of Devas and Gandharvas, who could assume various forms at will, wearing unfading garlands and clothes. Then in connection with the general mobilisation of the Vānaras at the command of Sugrīva, we are informed that

ततो नरेन्द्रसंकाशैस्तीक्ष्णदंष्ट्रैर्महाबले ।
कृत्स्ना संछादिता भूमिरसंख्येयैः स्रग्विभैः ॥

(IV 39 10)

the whole surface of the earth was covered with numerous powerful and princely Vānaras furnished with sharp teeth

Again, in connection with the same we are told that the mobilisation order issued by Sugrīva was conveyed by Vānaras पतत्रिज्योतिरश्मगा, who could soar through the aerial regions (IV 37 17) Then, of the Vānaras who mustered strong at the desire of Sugrīva in Kiskindhī we are told that these were

त इमे बहुविद्वान्तेर्बलिभिर्भीमविक्रमे ।
आगता वानरा घोरा दत्यदानघसनिभाः ॥
रथातर्कमपि दानाश्च यत्नान्ते जितद्विभा ।
पराक्रमेषु विख्याता व्यचसायेषु चोत्तमाः ॥
पृथिव्यम्बुचरा ॥

(IV. 40 3—5).

strong, vigorous and daring like the devil himself, powerful, untiring, valiant and patient that they had achieved numerous successes and could move about in water and on the dry land! Then, on the eve of the battle, while Sīrana was introducing various Vānara chiefs to Rāvana, he used a very significant word. In connection with the description he gave about the Vānara chief Sannādan, he said that

यस्मात्तु परम रूपं चतुष्पात्सु न विद्यते ।
ध्रुवः सनादनो नाम वानराणां पितामहः ॥

(VI. 27 18)

there stood Sannīdan, the Nestor of the Vānaras, who excelled all other quadrupeds in personal beauty. In so saying he clearly included the Vānaras in the class of beings known as the four-footed ones.

In another connection these Vīnaras have been described as ताम्रवदनाः हेमाभाः copper-faced and gold coloured (VI 42—14)

Lastly, more than once we are assured by the poet that these Vānaras had that delicate appendage attached to their body, which goes by the name of 'tail' We are told for instance

सर्वे विरुनन्लांगूला सर्वे दंष्ट्रानखायुधाः ।
सर्वे विरुनचित्राङ्गाः सर्वे च विकृताननाः ॥

(VI 41 46)

Before the opening of the battle all the multi-coloured Vānaras stood ready for the contest with wry faces and ugly tails, having teeth and nails for their weapon

Then the episode of setting fire to Hanumān's tail by the Rākṣasas is so well-known that it hardly needs any repetition (V 53).

In that connection says Rāvana

कपीनां किल लाङ्गूलमिष्टं भवति भूषणम् ।

The tail is the highly prized and favourite appendage of the Vānaras. In another connection we are told that

नीरुजौ राघवौ द्रष्टुं ननो चानख्ययपा ।
सिंहनादं तदा नेदुर्लांगूलं दुधुचुश्च ते ॥

on finding the Rāghava brothers completely restored to health (by favour of Gaṭura), the Vānara chieftains expressed their joy by roaring aloud and shaking their tails '

At this place a word or two about this nature may not be wide of the mark. The outstanding characteristic in

their nature seems to have been चापल्यम् or flightiness. Rāma accuses Vālin of this drawback in his character (IX. 18. 5). Hanumān himself testifies to this weakness in the character of the Vānaras, when he speaks to the despondent Angada in this strain—

नित्यमस्थिरचित्ता हि कपयो हरिपुरुष ।

नाक्षाप्यं विसहिष्यन्ति पुत्रदारं विना त्वया ॥

(VI. 54. 9)

O chief of the Vanaras, your kinsmen are naturally fickle-minded and when separated from their wives and children they may not tolerate with your commands. Elsewhere Rāvana's spy, Śuka, describes them as

प्रकृत्या केषनास्त्रीक्ष्ण वानरा राक्षसाधिप ।

wrathful and rough by nature. Again Rāvana pays the the following compliments in the course of his conversation with Prabhasta,

चपला हस्तिनीताश्च चलचित्ताश्च वानराः ।

(VI 57. 9)

the Vānaras are by nature, volatile, fickle-minded and unmethodical. But for this drawback in their nature, the Vānaras have been praised for wishing well of their masters (शुक्रहिने स्थिता), obedient (निदेशप्रतिनः IV. 40. 6), daring and persevering (परामर्शेषु व्याप्यता दयसायेषु चोत्तमाः, IV 10 1), swift (महाजयाः, IV-37-10), irresistible (दुष्प्रसहा), and powerful like the gods in the battle-field (युद्धेयपतामहाः, VI 25 3)

Before closing this topic I should like to dilate a little on the size of the Vānaras. The poet, it must be noted, is silent on this point. Occasionally he uses such epithets as मत्तानिभ मत्तद्विपान् ग्यमोद्यनिभ गान्धियान्, तामान् ईमपतानिभ (VI. 25 2), like mad elephants, like the banyan trees of the Gangetic regions and the Sal trees growing on the Himalayas,

महाशैलनिकाशकायाः (VI.27.48), huge like the mountains; उन्मत्त-
मातङ्गसन्निभा (VI. 27. 41), like mad elephants, महापद्मसंकाशा
महाजीमूतनिस्वनाः (VI. 27. 42), like huge mountains,
roaring aloud like the rumbling clouds, to indicate the size
of these Vanaras. But, I am afraid, the poet in his admira-
tion for these creatures, has lost all sense of proportion here.
He hardly states the fact. But light hails from other
quarters. The Vāyu Purāṇa lays down the standard height
of almost all creatures and there we find the undermentioned
couplet :

अंगुलानां सहस्रन्तु चत्वारिंशंगुलं विना ।

पञ्चाशत् हयानाञ्च उत्सेधः शारिणां स्मृतः ॥

(Vāyu 59. 12)

The standard height of the horse should be a thousand
finger-breadths less forty, and that of the Vānaras fifty
finger-breadths.

But I am inclined to think it was neither the one nor
the other. The one is highly inflated, while the other seeks to
depreciate the Vānaras of the Tretā Age. Therefore in
accordance with the view expressed in the same Purāṇa that
"every created being changes its size at the end of each
cycle" (Vāyu- 59-10, called युगावस्था by the Viṣṇu Purāṇa
II. 1. 27) I hazard this opinion that the truth lay somewhere
between the two extremes, and that the Vānaras of the
Tretā Age were certainly over 50 finger breadths in height,
though smaller in size than the elephants and the hills !

Num'cr and habits—It is sheer waste of energy to
ransack the Rāmāyaṇa for discussing the exact number of
the Vānara contemporaries of Rāma, for before composing
his immortal poem, Vālmiki never cared to take a census of
these creatures. Yet by gathering together the pieces of
information scattered throughout the book, one is just able

to form a rough estimate about the Vānara-population of India in the Tretā Age. Alongside with this we shall also tell our readers where they came from.

When Lakṣmana on the expiry of the rainy season wrathfully approached Sugriva to call for an explanation for his dilatoriness in giving aid to Rāma as had been promised, Tārā hastened to placate him with the following words —

कृता सुसंस्था सौमित्रे सुग्रीवेण पुरा यथा ।

अथ तैः वानरैः सर्वैरागन्तव्यं महाबलैः ॥

ऋक्षकेदिसहस्राणि गोलांगूलशतानि च ।

अथ त्वामुपयास्यन्ति जहि कोपमरिन्दम ॥

कोट्योऽनेकास्तु काकुत्स्थ कपोनां दोततेजसाम् ॥

(IV. 35. 21 22)

As had been arranged previously by Sugriva, the Vānars were due that day. 1000 Koṭis of Rkṣas (bears), 100 Koṭis of Golāṅgala Vānars, in addition to many koṭis of illustrious Vānars were expected to arrive that day.

When the general mobilisation order issued by Sugriva reached the ears of the Vānars, the number that responded to that call, was as follows. "3 Krors from the Añjana Hills; 10 krors from the Aṣṭāchala regions, 1000 krors from the Kailasa hills, 1000,000 (one Padma) from Himālayan regions; 100 krors from the Viadhya hills; Vānars without number came from the Kiroda Sea, many more came from various forests, caves and rivers" (IV 37-20-26). The total in this case comes roughly to 1 million, 2 thousand and 13.

When the armies under various Vānara chiefs actually arrived at Kīśkindha the muster-roll was as follows

"Sata-Vah supplied 1 krord and 10 thousand, Tārā's father many krors and thousands, Rumā's father 1000 krors,

Kesari many thousands, Gavakṣa 1000 kṛors, Dhumra 2000 kṛors, Panasa 3 kṛors, Nila 10 kṛors, Gavaya 5 kṛors, Darimukha 1000 kṛors, Maṇḍa and Diviḍa thousands of kṛors, Gaja 3 kṛors, Jambavan 10 kṛors, Rumanavan 100 kṛors, Gandha Madana hundreds of thousands of kṛors, Angada 1000 Padmas and 100 Śaṅkhas, Tarā 5 kṛors, Hanuman 1000 kṛors, Nala 100 kṛors and hundreds of thousands, Darimukha 10 kṛors in addition to the huge armies brought by Śarava, Kumuda, Vahni, Rambha and others' (IV. 39 12 37) Expressed in terms of the English system of notation the figures would come to billions and trillions. It would be interesting to compare the huge figure given above with the estimate of the Vanara army as given to Rāvana by Śaraṇa. "Nila surrounded by hundreds of thousands of Vanara chiefs. Angada at the head of a huge army, Nala surrounded by another big army, a huge army consisting of the Vanaras of the Sandal forests led by Samrochana a big army under Kumuda, Rambha with an army composed of the Vanaras residing on the Vindhya, the Kṛṣṇa and the Sahya hills. Śarava from the Sihva hills at the head of an army composed of 30 kṛors. Vihara army consisting of 41 lacs from the Pāriyatra hills, under Panasa an army of 50 lacs, another army of 60 lacs under Vinata, 70 lacs under Gavaya' (VI 26 11 46) Alongside with this should be read the following which is only a continuation of the above extract, "Kṛathana stands there surrounded by an army of 1000 kṛores of Vānaras, 1000 lacs with Pramathu Gavikṣa, with the Golāṅgala army of 100,00,000 Vānaras, Gaja, Gavakṣa, Gavaya, Nala and Nila each attended by 10 kṛors (VI 27 23 47) Then if we care to compare Śaraṇa's estimate with the one given by Śuka to Ravana, the number is simply bewildering! For says he

एषां कोटिसहस्राणि नव पञ्च च सप्त च ।
 तथा शकुसहस्राणि तथा वृन्दशतानि च ॥
 एते सुग्रीवसचिवाः किष्किन्धानिलया सदा ।
 हरयो देवगन्धर्वरूपज्ञाः कामरूपिणः ॥

(VI 28 4 5)

These Vānaras, numbering 100 Vṛndas, 1000 Śankus and 21000 krors, born of the Devas and the Gandharvas and assuming various forms at will, are the immediate companions of Sugriva having from Kiskindhā

And when we take into consideration the fact that यत्त फल्गु बल किञ्चित्द्वयैरोपपद्यताम् । एतद्वि कृत्य धैरं नो विक्रमेश प्रयुज्य तम् ॥ (VI 4 13) only able bodied persons were allowed to join the distant bound expeditions, we admit that the number simply staggers our imagination. And when we come to include the old and the decrepit, the young ones and the she vanaras, who were left behind the number goes up still higher. So after making due deductions from the poetic exaggeration indulged in by our poet, we cannot but admit that at that time Kiskindhā must have been one of the most thickly populated parts of the world. And is it not probable that it was the numerical strength of the Vānaras alone that led the banished, the helpless Rāma to seek for their help in times of distress?

Their past history—It is a well known fact that the present is the child of the past and that a nation without history is doomed. For it has nothing behind it to look back upon and to gather inspiration from. A nation without a past has no future before. If it be true of all nations, then it is true of the Vānaras too for they claimed to be a nation. The Vānaras, it must be told had a glorious past to look back upon and to draw inspiration from, for a still more brilliant future was anxiously waiting for them. We are told—

चानराणां प्रभाचोऽयं न केन विदितः पुरा ।

देवतानां सकाशं च ये गच्छन्ति निमन्त्रिताः ॥

Who is not aware of the influence exerted by the Vanaras in olden times, as they used to go to the Devas on invitation ?

Then with regard to Jambavan, says Sarana to Ravana—

एतेन साह्यं तु महत्कृतं शक्य धीमता ।

देवासुरे जाम्बवता लब्धाश्च बहवो वराः ॥

(VI 27 12).

that he obtained numerous boons from Indra from rendering a joeman's service to him during the Deva Asura wars. Again, with regard to Sannadina we are told—

येन युद्धं तदा दत्तं रणे शक्रस्य धीमता ।

पराजयश्च न प्राप्तः सोऽयं वृषपयूथपः ॥

that he kept up an even fight with Indra ' Then with regard to Hanuman we are told how the newly born babe flew across 3000 Yojanas in an attempt to devour the rising Sun (VI 28 10 15). Again with reference to Valm we are told that his admirers mourned bitterly remembering how after fighting for full fifteen years he did to death Golabha—the Gandharva Chief (IV. 22. 27 29) ' Tara weeps remembering

या दत्ता देवराजेन तत्र तुष्टेन सयुगे ।

शतकौम्भीं प्रियां मातां तां ते पश्यामि नेह किम् ॥

(V 23 25)

how formerly being pleased with his skill in fighting, Indra awarded a golden garland to him '.

Then how Valm killed the Asura Māyavi, the son of Dundubhi in the depths of a dark cave after fighting with him for a year (IV 9 1 22), and how he killed the buffalo shaped Dānava, Dundubhi who had challenged the Samudra and the Himavan to fight a duel with him (IV, 11-7 47), is known to every student of history. Lastly, how completely the king of the Vanaras outwitted the chief of

the Rāk-asas is known to every body (VII. 34. 11-34)
Then Jāmbavān, while persuading Hanūmān to take the leap
across the sea, describes his own achievements in by-gone
days. Says he

त्रिचिकमे मया तान सशैलवनफानना ।

त्रिःसतहृत्यः पृथिवी परिक्रान्ता प्रदक्षिणम् ॥

तदा चैषधयोऽस्माभिः संचिता देवशासनात् ।

निर्मथ्यममृतं यामिस्नदानीं नो महद्वलम् ॥

(IV. 66. 32-33).

When Viṣṇu was born as Vāmana, at that time I walked
round this earth clad in hills and forests full 21 times, and
being commanded by the Devas we gathered the medicinal
herbs which being cast into the ocean and then churned,
produced nectar.

It may not be out of place to mention here that it was this
same Jāmbavān whose daughter Jambavati was sought in
marriage by Śrī Kṛṣṇa at a future date (Viṣṇu Purāṇa
IV. 13, 31).

It was the brilliant achievement of the Vānaras such as
these that had made their past glorious, and taking courage
from these examples, the Vānaras of Rāma's age sought to
make their future still brighter ! And it is about the life of
these Vānaras that we are going to speak to-day,

Social organisation—Regarding the organisation of the
Vānara-society, Vālmiki says

ते प्रधानेषु यूयेषु हरीषां हरियूयपाः ।

बभूवुर्यूयपथ्रेष्ठान्घीरांश्चाजनयन्हरीन् ॥

अन्ये श्रुतवनः प्रस्थानुपतस्थुः सहस्रशः ।

अन्ये नानाविधान्शैलफाननानि च भेजिरे ॥

सूर्यपुत्रं च सुग्रीवं शक्रपुत्रं च चालिनाम् ।

भानराद्युपतस्थुस्ते सर्वं च हरियूयपाः ॥

नलं नीलं हनूमन्तमन्यांश्च हरियूयपान् ॥

(I. 17.30- 33).

These, foremost of the Vānaras, became the chiefs of different clans. These in their turn produced more Vānaras. Some retired to the sides of the Rkavān hills by thousands, while others took refuge in various hills and forests. But all Vānaras owed allegiance to Valin, the son of Indra or to Sugriva, the son of the Sun god, either *directly*, or *indirectly* through such chiefs as Nala, Nila or Hanumān. It may be pointed out here with advantage that the ancient Vānara society resembled the ancient German Society in this respect, and our readers need not be told that here lay the seed of the Feudal system of the later age. In the Father-land, each and every German was bound to his lord so far as his *person* was concerned. He was obliged to work for him in times of peace in the home land, and follow him or fight for him in times of war in distant countries. This aspect of Feudalism is called by the historians the *personal* element. Later on, when land became plentiful, it at once became the tie that bound the vassal to the person of his lord. Even then the personal element was present there.

Now, these Vānaras were divided into three classes, viz., the Rkās, the Vānaras and the Golāngulās (17-19). It would have been interesting if we could have given a description of the personal appearance of the members of each of these three classes. But we regret to observe that our poet is almost silent on this point. Still a few words on this point may not be uninteresting.

The poet uses the word गुरु at several places but never tries to give a description of the personal appearance of these. But with reference to Jambavan he uses the significant epithet हरिश्रेष्ठ at one place (V 57-22). This leads me to think that the गुरु were not bears, but that they were a class of Vānaras who used the figure of a bear as their totem like the North American Indians and the Australian Savages.

In this connection it should be noted that the word हरि is never used as a synonym for the word bear in the Sanskrit Language but as the use is rather singular, I am afraid, I cannot speak with sufficient force

With regard to the Golāngulas, Sarana describes them in these words—

सितमुखा घोर गोलान्गुला महावताः ।

(VI 27 32)

the black faced, the terrible and the powerful Golāngulas
With regard to the Vanaras it must be observed that they were of various colours (IV 37 20 26)

Food and drink—The favourite sons of nature as these Vānaras were they lived on the raw products of nature, such as fruits and roots. Though aware of the use of fire (IV 5 12 16), it seems that the art of cooking had not made any progress in the Vanara society. Says Valm to Rāma,—

फलमूलाशन नित्य वानर वनगोचरम् ॥

(IV 17 25)

We Vanaras are foresters by nature and live on fruits and roots. Again

वय वनचरा राम मृगा मूलफलाशिन ।

एषा प्रकृतिरस्माक पुरुषस्य नरेवर ॥

भूमिर्द्विषय रूप च निग्रहे कारणानि च ।

तत्र कस्ते वने लोभो मदीयेषु फलेषु वा ॥

(IV 19 30 31)

O Lord of men you are the perfect Being while we foresters naturally live on roots and fruits. Land gold and beauty are the perennial sources of quarrel, while our forests or their yields can hardly provoke you to open hostilities with us

Then of the Vānaras who in response to Sugriva's orders, came from the Himālayan regions, they, we are told, फलमूलेन जीवन्तः (IV. 37-23) lived on fruits and roots and of those that came from the coast of the Kśiroda Sea, we are told that they lived on cocoanuts (नारिकेलशनाः, IV. 7.25).

Again of the expeditionary force that went to the South to fight with the Rākṣasas, we are told that they marched,

भक्षयन्तः सुगन्धोनि मधुनि च फलानि च ।

उद्वहन्तो महावृक्षान् मञ्जरीपुञ्जधारिण ॥

(IV. 4. 7)

subsisting on fruits and drinking the sweet-smelling Madhu (honey-wine) and carrying huge trees bedecked with clusters of stalks laden with fruits and flowers

At the out-set, it must be told that the Vānaras were not the members of the Temperance Society and that they in accordance with the custom of the day very often used to take to drinking

On the approach of the autumn, Rāma is justly angry with Sugriva, for steeped in wine and women, he failed to locate the whereabouts of Sitā (IV 30 79) While Lakṣmana was passing through Kiṣkindhā, the atmosphere of the streets was laden with the smell of maireya and madhu (IV 33 7) Sugriva asks Hanuman to send for the Vānaras of the Mahārana hills who were hard drinkers of the maireya and madhu (IV. 37. 7)

The intoxicating effect of madhu on the Vānaras is a pleasant reading After discovering Sitā in Lankā, Aṅgada's followers broke into the Madhurana, the preserved forest of Sugriva, and there they drank hard and then began to dance and frisk about, and sing and laugh and weep, recite aloud, and leap about (V. 61 14-19) Then we are told that in this state they picked a quarrel with the guards and

roughly handled Dadhimukha, the officer in charge and his men (V 62 9 34)

Again, when the expeditionary force reached the Sahya hills, we are told that the Vānaras, as the result of another hard drink, pulled down the branches of the trees, uprooted creepers, roared aloud from the tops of trees and jumped from tree to tree (VI 4 88 91) Among the Vānaras probably the practice was universal. Men as well as women, every body kissed the cup. We are told that Tīra, when she came out at the desire of Sugrīva to receive Lakṣmī on his behalf, did not feel shy as she was in a drunken state (IV 33 40)

Dress—The Vanaras it must be noted, were the inhabitants of a tropical country. So their dress suited the climatic conditions of the land in which they lived. Yet it displayed their aesthetic sense as well as their power of the purse.

Sugrīva complained bitterly of the conduct of Valī when he said to his patron Rama that—

एवमुक्त्वा तु मा तत्र चस्नेहेकेन धानर ।
तदा निर्वासयामास धाली विगतसाध्वस ॥

(IV 10 26)

he was banished by his powerful brother without a second cloth ! On the occasion of the encounter between the Vanara princes—Valī and Sugrīva we are told that—

सुग्रीवोऽप्यनदृष्ट्वोर वालिनो हानकारणात् ।
गाढं परिहितो वेगान्नादेर्निन्दनिवाम्बरम् ॥

(IV 12 15)

Sugrīva winding his cloth round the loins tightly bellowed the challenge to Valī tearing open the sky.

Again immediately before the final encounter Valī finding Sugrīva ready for it गाढं परिधिधे वासो धाली परम-
कोपन (IV 16 16) tightly wound the cloth round his waist

On the completion of the cremation ceremony of Vālin, we are told that

तत शोकाभिसतसं सुग्रीवः क्लिन्वाससम् ।
शास्तामृगमहामात्रा परिवार्येषतस्थरे ॥

(IV 26 1)

the high Vanara officials squatted round the grief stricken Sugriva who was then wearing wet clothes

When Sita for the first time saw Hanūman in Lanka, she found him वेष्टिनाज्जुनघट्टम्, wearing a white cloth (V 32 1) Lastly on the occasion of Rāma's coronation ceremony Sita was presented with two pieces of cloth, white like the moon's rays and some beautiful ornament by Rāma. It is said that she transferred these articles to Hanūmān, besides a necklace which she took out from her own person (VI 128 78 79) When Tara at the desire of Sugriva went out to placate the wrathful Lakṣmaṇa on behalf of her Lord it is said that

सा प्रसृतन्ती मदविह्वलाक्षी प्रलम्बकाञ्चो गुणहेमसूना ।
सलक्ष्णा लक्ष्मणसन्निधानं जगाम तारा नमितागयष्टि ॥

(IV 33 38)

the auspicious Tara with her person slightly bent down, approached Lakṣmaṇa with her steps unsteady and eyes rolling about, wearing a noble girdle string round her zone and a long gold string dangling from her neck

Again, on entering the harem of Sugriva, Lakṣmaṇa is said to have found it well supplied with noble looking girls possessed of beauty and youth well attired and richly decorated with ornaments engaged in preparing garlands (IV 33 22 23)

At the desire of Rāma and Sita the Vanara ladies of Sugriva's harem dressed their persons lavishly before starting for Ayodhya in the aerial car (VI 123 36)

Enough has been said above to show (I) that the Vānaras of the Tretā Age did not go about sky clad like their present descendants (II) that both males and females probably used two pieces of cloths—the upper cloth and the loin cloth—like the Aryan Contemporaries,

(III) that they did not use sewn garments prepared by the tailor

It would be interesting here to compare the dress used by the Vānaras in the Pura Kalpa. The Padma Purāṇa (Patala Khanda) gives a resume of the Rīmīyāna as it was known in the Pura Kalpa. There we are told that the Vānaras were gold coloured in appearance that they used ear-rings the sacrificial thread and that they wore a short piece of cloth over the privities—*कोपीन*, made of *Maunji* grass (Padma II 71 155). But just at present we are speaking of the Vānaras of the Tretā Age of the Varaha Kalpa. And it is just possible that in that age—though not universally, as is laid down in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa that *शरीरवाणकामो वै सोपान्तक सदा प्रजेत्* (III 12 38) those wishing to keep well should always walk with leathern shoes on—the Vānaras of the higher ranks at least actually used shoes. We find that on the occasion of Sugriva's coronation ceremony he was supplied with a pair of leathern shoes (IV 26-27).

And these Vānaras used ornaments made of gold and precious stones too. We are told that Vālin before going out to fight with Dundubhi put on the necklace of gold (*काञ्चन-माला*) given him by Indra (IV 11 39). Indeed our poet at one place describes the Lord of the Vānaras as *हेममालिन*, (IV 11 61). This precious necklace of Vālin, we are told, was "made of gold and set with diamonds" (IV 17 5). Of Sugriva we are told that when he bowed down at Rīmās

meet with great affection, his ornaments hung down (from his neck) (IV 12 6) Indeed Rama in the course of the explanation given by him to Sugriva as to why he did not kill Valin during the first encounter says

अलङ्कारेण वेषेण प्रमाणेन गतेन च ।

त्व च सुग्रीव वाली च सदृशो स्य परस्परम् ॥

*

(IV 12 30)

That the similarity between the two brothers was so very exact in the matter of ornaments, dress and motion, that he could not distinguish the one from the other

Angada, the crown prince, has several times been described as कनकागद्ग, wearing a pair of gold bracelets on the upper arm (IV 18 50) Later on we are assured that Valm, too had these ornaments on (IV 20 24) Then it has already been pointed out above how Sita on the occasion of Rama's coronation ceremony gave a precious necklace to Hanuman (VI 123 77 78)

As in ancient India both males and females used the same ornaments to decorate their various limbs we can safely conclude that the sbe Vānaras too used the various ornaments noted above and represented to have been worn by the males Only two ornaments remain to be noted here that have been used with reference to sbe Vānaras only, and these are नूपुर and काञ्ची

When Lakṣmaga entered the harem of Sugriva, we are told (IV 3 25) that the noble looking son of Sumitra abashed on hearing the sound produced by the नूपुर (anklets) and काञ्ची (girdle string) used by the inmates of the harem

In connection with the same topic we are assured by the poet that these girls were liberally provided with beautiful ornaments (भूषणोत्तमभूषिता IV 33 23) And it has already been noted above that when Tāra appeared before

Lakṣmaṇa, she was wearing a girdle string and a chain of gold (IV 33 38)

The Vānaras were great lovers of scents and flowers. While Lakṣmaṇa was passing through the streets of Kiṣkindhā, he found the atmosphere surcharged with the sweet scent of the *aguru* sandal and lotus flowers (IV 33 7)

Again Lakṣmaṇa found Sugriva

दिव्याभरणचित्रांग दिव्यरूपं यशस्विनम् ।

दिव्यमात्स्याम्बरधर महेन्द्रमिव दुर्जयम् ॥

दिव्याभरणमालाभिः समन्वितः ।

(IV 33 64 65)

the glorious one, (seated) in the midst of his heavenly beauty, his limbs profusely decorated with ornaments and ointments, and surrounded by girls furnished with divine ornaments and unfading garlands

And before speaking to Lakṣmaṇa, Sugriva is said to have torn away

ततः परलगतं मात्स्य चित्रं बहुगुणमक्षत् (IV 36 3)

the grand, multi coloured and meritorious garland round his neck

Manners and customs—Under this section I would quote instances to show that the Vānaras like all other civilised peoples of the world had a recognised code of etiquette to guide them in the society and that they were a civil and polite people

Unlike the savages the Vānaras could distinguish the right from the wrong and if they happened to offend anybody, then instead of fighting with him for the purpose of upholding the wrong cause, they were ready to ask for a pardon. And how this was done is interesting to note. On the demise of Vāli, the inmates of his harem led by Tārā wept saying

यद्यपि किञ्चिदसंप्रधार्य कृतं मया न्यात्तव दीर्घबाहो ।
क्षमस्व मे तद्धरिवंशनाथ व्रजामि मूर्ध्ना तव वीर पादो ॥

(IV. 20. 25).

Long armed Lord of the Vānara-race, if we have offended you in any way on an unguarded moment, then placing our heads at your feet we ask for a pardon

And this is exactly what we do if we happen to offend a superior person !

Then in the matter of according a hearty reception to an honoured guest, these Vānaras yielded place to none. We are told of Sugriva that as soon as Lakṣmana appeared in sight,

उत्पपात हरिभ्रेष्ठो हित्वा सौवर्णमासनम् ।
महान्महेन्द्रस्य यथा खलकृत इव ध्वजः ॥
उत्पतन्तमनूत्पेतू रुमाप्रभृतय स्त्रियः ।
सुप्रोचं गगने पूर्णं चन्द्रं तारागणा इव ॥

(IV 34 3—4)

Sugriva, the best of the Vānaras, was up on his legs, leaving the seat of gold, like the richly decorated banner consecrated to Indra, and he was followed by Rumā and other she-Vānaras even like the stars that follow the full moon

Again when Sugriva went to see Rāma for the first time after his coronation, it is said that on arriving at the spot where Rāma was waiting, he along with Lakṣmana left the conveyance in which they were being carried, then appearing before Rāma, he folded his hands together and his action was imitated by all the Vānaras present there. Rāma too, on finding the lord of the Vānaras humbly lying at his feet, raised him gently, embraced him affectionately and then asked him to take a seat (IV 38 15—19) :

When Hanumān returned from Lankā after tracing the whereabouts of Sītā, he was affectionately received by his grateful companions. On that occasion, it is said, finding Hanumān dropping down from the sky, his companions waited with folded hands, and when he landed on the summit of that hill, all stood round him with beaming faces, some presented him with fruits and roots, some chattered aloud, while others ran for fetching branches of trees to sit on. Hanumān then saluted the aged ones, such as Jāmbavān and others and the crown-prince Angada. Then having been honoured by them, he communicated the success of his mission in a few, well-chosen words (V. 57. 28—36).

These Vānaras also knew the art of introducing themselves to unknown persons and leaving a lasting impression on their minds. When Hanumān in the guise of a Bhikṣu (wanderer) approached Rāma for the first time, he began with humble salutations and profuse panegyrics (IV.3.3—4). In this way he was successful in rousing the confidence of Rāma. Again how Hanumān was able to rouse the confidence of the much-persecuted Sītā, through his winning manners and guarded speech (V. 33—1ff), is known to everyone.

They also had the necessary training as to how best to conduct themselves in the presence of the superiors. Sugrivo while sending the Vānaras to every quarter of the globe in search of Sītā, first of all dismissed most of his Vānara chiefs, then humbly approaching his father-in-law Suyoga, the father of Tārā, he humbly bowed down at his feet and with folded hands proposed to send him to the West at the head of a search-party (IV. 42. 1—6). Again in reply to the encomium bestowed on him by the old veteran Jāmbavān (VI 74 21—23) when Rāma and Lakṣmīnagar had been mortally wounded by Indrajit, Hanumān is said to have

humbly approached him, and then bowed down to him repeating his name (VI—74—24) . Again, while Rāma gave Hanūmān his signet ring in order that he might have a free access to Sitā, Hanūmān taking it from Rāma, is said to have first of all put it on his hand, then *with folded hands saluted him*, touched his feet and departed (IV—44—15). Similarly, when Sitā gave him her crest-jewel for favor of carrying it to Rāma, on that occasion too Hanūmān having taken it from her, is said to have saluted her and then walking reverentially round her bowed down to her once more and then stood aside (V 38—68)

Indeed the custom of giving presents and accepting them was well advanced in the Vānara—society. We are told, for instance, that the messengers despatched by Sugriva to convey the general mobilisation order, intentionally broke their journey on the Himālayas to gather the heavenly fruits and roots and medicinal herbs from the sacrificial grounds of Śiva to win the favor of their king (IV 37 31—32) . Again, on the eve of Sugriva's coronation, Hanūmān is said to have approached Rāma and persuaded him on behalf of his master to pay a visit to the town so that his liege lord might get an opportunity to return thanks by making rich presents to him (IV—26—7)

These Vānaras also knew how to swear eternal friendship solemnly in the presence of the burning fire. We are told how in accordance with the advice of Kaundhya (III 72—17—18) Rāma was desirous of entering into an alliance with Sugriva. The scene is worth describing in full. Hence this attempt. "After Hanūmān had formally introduced Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa to Sugriva, the latter stretched forth his arm and asked Rāma to hold it in his own if he was inclined to make friendship with a Vānara like him. Pursuant to his wishes Rāma pressed the offered hand in his own

and then embraced him affectionately. Hanuman in the mean time had produced a fire by rubbing two pieces of wood together. Then having worshipped it duly, he placed it between the two. Lastly Rāma and Sugriva walked round it solemnly. Thus the two entered that day into a life long alliance, which death alone could separate" (IV 5 8—6). Sugriva was justly proud of this fact, as he alludes to this later on

त्व हि पाणिप्रदानेन वयस्यो मे ऽमित्राक्षिकम् ।

(IV—8—27)

Thou art my sworn friend, who hast offered his hand in eternal friendship. In this connection it should be noted that Ravana too after his discomfiture in the hands of Vālin is said to have sworn eternal friendship to his victor in the presence of the fire (VII—34—42)

The rites and ceremonies connected with the coronation ceremony of Sugriva deserve to be quoted in full, we are told that "the partisans of Sugriva collected the articles required for the ceremony, viz a white umbrella, worked in gold, a pair of fly whisks furnished with rods of gold, various kinds of precious stones, seeds, medicinal herbs, the tender shoots and flowers of trees yielding milk, white clothes, white unguent (अनुलेपन), scents, wreaths, lilies and lotuses, sandal-paste, various kinds of scents, fried grains (अक्षतम्), gold, प्रियगु seeds, honey, clarified butter, curd, tiger skin, and a pair of costly shoes

"The ceremony actually commenced with the appearance of sixteen maidens who held in their hands such auspicious articles as the मन शिला (Red Arsenic—Wilson) and गोरोचना (a bright yellow pigment found in the heel of a cow, or prepared from the urine of the animal ibid) Then having propitiated the noble Brāhmins with gifts of precious stones,

clothes and food, they proceeded to instal the best of the Vānaras on the throne. Next, Brāhmanas well-versed in the Mantra-lore offered oblations to the burning fire in accordance with the prescribed rites. This was followed by the pouring of scented water brought from various holy rivers and seas in gold pitchers and bullhorns by the various Vānara-chiefs on the head of Sugrīva who was seated (on a seat of gold, covered with a beautiful cover), facing the east at the top of the palace that had been profusely decorated for the occasion". And we are assured by the poet that the whole ceremony was conducted on the lines recommended by the Śāstras and the foremost of the sages (IV. 26. 22—36).

In this connection I should like to tell the readers how the Vānaras disposed of their dead. Fortunately Vālmiki has given a faithful description of the rites and ceremonies connected with the cremation of Vālin and we can only quote it *in extenso* to satisfy our curious readers. We are told that Lakṣmana asked Sugrīva to employ the Vānaras in collecting a large quantity of dry wood and sandal-wood too, and to request the crown-Prince to fetch garlands, different kinds of cloths, clarified butter, oil and scents. Then he asked Tārā to get a conveyance (शिविका) and to ask the hearers to get ready.

(IV 25 12—19)

"On the arrival of the richly decorated and well furnished conveyance Sugrīva and Angada placed the corpse of Vālin, gorgeously attired, garlanded and duly ornamented, in it. In accordance with the instructions of Sugrīva the bier was carried to the river-side preceded by the Vānaras who scattered precious stones of different kinds and followed by Tārā and other wives of the dead chief weeping bitterly.

(IV. 25. 28—36)

"Then a large number of Vānaras constructed the funeral pyre on the solitary bank of a hill stream, lashed by water ; meanwhile the hearers placing the bier on the ground waited at a lonely spot with a heavy heart (IV 25 37-39)

" Shortly afterwards Angada and Sugriva with an aching heart laid the corpse on the pyre Angada at last set fire to it and walked round the burning pyre according to the prescribed rites Then all the Vānaras headed by Angada, Tārā and Sugriva walked into the river to offer water in memory of the departed soul under the guidance of Rama (IV 25 49 53)

Town and Town life—India from the very dawn of her history has been an agricultural country This circumstance has forced her sons to live in small sized scattered villages and hamlets If this has been true of her human children, it applied with double force in the case of her Vānara children These Vanaras, as has already been told, mainly dwelt on the summits of hills and in jungles But when we speak of the Vānaras organised politically, of a Vānara kingdom, it at once reminds us of the Vānara Capital for in Ancient India every little blessed kingdom had a capital of its own Its size, its importance or its population did not matter much Yet it was the Capital where the king with his little court resided

This Kuskindhā was the little capital of the mighty Vānara kingdom The poet is very liberal in the use of high sounding epithets to describe this town For instance, he calls it resplendent without a match अतुलप्रभा (IV 11 21), protected by the valour of Vālin (IV 13 1) nursed by the prowess of the son of Indra (IV 13 30) beautiful (IV 26 19) unassailable (दुराघर्ष IV 13 29), unattainable (दुरासदा IV 31 26) and so on Besides impressing his readers with its dignity and might, the poet also gives

us some information regarding its position, defence and beauty. More than once he calls it a little town (IV. 16 13). Then he tells us that it was situated in cave (1.1 67, IV. 26 41) near the Prasravana hills (IV 27. 26). This town, as was customary in Ancient India, was provided with the city gates (IV. 9 5, IV. 11 26 27) and surrounded by walls and moats (IV 31 27) It was defended by forts (IV 19 15), bristling with a net work of Vānaras, decorated with gold and studded with banners and machines (IV. 14. 5 6)—a great city difficult of access and full of armies (IV 31 16) Again, while introducing Sugriva to Ravana Śuka describes Kīṣkindhā in the following words. Accompanied by his chieftains, he dwells in the fort of Kīṣkindhā, clad in dense forests and the most inaccessible of all hill forts *

* In this connection the testimony of Brabman is worth considering Says he—

गच्छ मद्वचनाद्भूत किंकिधा नाम वै शुभाम् ।

सा वास्य सुखसम्पन्ना महती च पुरी शुभा ॥

तत्र वानरपूयानि सुबहूनि वसन्ति च ।

बहुरत्नसमाकीर्णा वानरैः कामरूपिभिः ॥

पुण्या पुण्यवती दुर्गा चातुर्वर्ण्यपुरस्कृता ।

विश्वकर्मकृता दिव्या मन्त्रियागाच्च शोभना ॥

(VII 37 (A) 47-49).

Messenger, you take (Rkṣa-Raja) to the beautiful town named Kīṣkindhā. It is extensive, mentorious and it would be the source of his prosperity, because it is the habitat of numerous Vānaras. Viśva Karmaṇ constructed that beautiful, holy and divine town at my desire. It is inaccessible, full of articles of merchandise, abounding in costly jewels, the home of all the four Vānaras as well as of the Vānaras.

Yet the defence-works mentioned above did not mar beauty, for we are told that it was well provided with gardens (IV. 27—28), abounding in gems, heavenly, adorned with flowering gardens and beautiful (IV. 33—4), full charming palaces and mansions, decorated with various precious stones and embellished with all sorts of flowering trees that produced fruits whenever wished for (IV. 33—5), and crowded with Vānaras decently clad and wearing unfading garlands, who could assume various forms at will (IV. 33—6)

Such then was Kīśkindhā, the mighty little Capital of mightier nation, and as for the life that vibrated therein we cannot do better than quote in full as it appeared to Lakṣmaṇa while he was going to the Palace passing through the streets for demanding an explanation from Sugrīva for his dilatoriness. "On receiving the formal permission of Sugrīva, Lakṣmaṇa at the desire of Rāma entered Kīśkindhā situated in the midst of a cave. At his sight the guards at the gateway waited quietly with folded hands. But finding him in a distemper, they dared not follow him. Lakṣmaṇa on entering that spacious cave found it studded with precious stones, well provided with flower-gardens, thickly beset with closely-built palaces and mansions, decorated with all sorts of jewels, embellished with all sorts of desire yielding trees, crowded with Vānars, the children of the Devas and the Gandharvas—all decently clad and wearing divine garlands, assuming various forms at will, and noble looking,—and the atmosphere of the streets was laden with the sweet smell of Madhu

"He then passes by the beautifully white mansions belonging to the various Vānara chiefs, resplendent like the clouds, adorned with sweet-smelling garlands, abounding in wealth and grains and liberally supplied with beautiful

women Shortly afterwards he found himself standing before the palace of Sugriva surrounded by a white wall built of crystal stones looking like Indra's palace white capped like the summit of the Kailāsa hills thickly planted with the desire yielding flowering fruit giving shady kalpa trees, that came as a present from Indra and charming like the inky cloud pregnant with water closely watched by strong Vanaras carrying weapons adorned with unfading garlands and having a porch made of molten gold

' Lakṣmaṇa next entered unrestricted into the harem of the Vanara prince even like the noon day sun darting through the thick layers of clouds He found it handsomely furnished with bedsteads and comfortable seats made of gold and silver There he heard the strains of melodious music, both vocal and instrumental rich in keeping time wording and ornamentation He also came across numerous girls there possessed of youth and beauty nobly descended and well supplied with raiments and ornaments engaged in manufacturing garlands also he saw there some of the attendants of Sugriva who appeared contented ever ready to carry out orders and moderately provided with ornaments (IV 33 1 24) Such was the life that the Vanaras led in their Capital

Morals —If right conduct has the public weal for its ultimate object then the best synonym that I could suggest for the English term morals would be सदाचार । For सदाचार has also the same object in view (Manu II 5) Now this सदाचार has been defined as follows

साधयः क्षीरदायस्तु सज्जन्द साधुयाचक ।
तेषामाचरणं यत्तु सदाचारः स उच्यते ॥

(Viṣṇu Purāṇa III 11—3)

The term सत् stands for good men, and only such men are called good as are faultless. The conduct pursued by such men is called सदाचार ।

In this connect on it would be interesting to note the authorities whose conduct was considered right by the Ancient Aryas. Says the same Purana—

सप्तर्षयोऽथ मनवः प्रजाना पतयस्तथा ।

सदाचारस्य वक्ता कर्त्ताश्च महीपते ॥

(Ibid, III 11)

O King, the seven Rsis, the Manus and the Prajāpi enunciate and practised the code of Right Conduct

The only remark that I should like to make here is the that these sages laid down the code of Right conduct for advancing the common weal of the Aryan population of India. They were not competent enough to be followed by all the tribes and nations that lived in India at that time, for the standard of morality has varied from people to people and tribe to tribe. For what is sauce for the gander, has never been the sauce for the goose ! In spite of this fact if the Aryan standard of morality came to be adopted in India generally, it goes to prove the mighty move taken by Aryan Imperialism in bye gone days. But whatever differences there may be in details the moral standard of each and every people aims at securing the common weal for all its members. Expressed in other words it would mean that the moral standard adopted by certain people is the result of long standing custom, it has the sanction of ages behind it. Therefore however disgusting may the morals of a certain people appear to be at first sight to an outsider, it must be remembered that these have a tradition behind them and as such they ought to be respected. Did Procrustes' bed fit anybody and every body that happened to lie on it ?

The moral history of mankind begins with a promiscuous relation between man and woman. There was a time in the history of every old world nation when man was the slave of his instinct, and in the matter of sexual relation with woman, he played the animal. But after some time, probably with a view to establish the common weal by making an end of petty jealousies and bickerings for the sake of woman, man reduced her to serfdom to carry out his whims and fancies by tying her to his person in an artificial bond that goes by the name of marriage. Still nature had her way and man was not satisfied with one woman. This consideration combined with economic pressure gave rise to the system of polygamy. What is true of all nations is true of India too. Says the Skanda Purāṇa—

‘Formerly women indulged in promiscuity. But for the purity of the rising generation Vṛhaspati transferred a fourth part of Indra’s sin to them thus checking promiscuity (1 16 41)

The case of Jātili (Chhāndogya IV 4 1 4) is so well known that it needs no repetition here.

Then how the great sage Śvātaketu came to establish the institution of marriage in the Aryan society in India is vividly described in the Mahabharata (1—128—12)

I am strongly inclined to suspect that the Rāmāyana speaks of that particular period of Vānara history when in their society at least promiscuity reigned supreme when the idea of respecting female chastity had made little headway. Yet their society was not matriarchal and there was extant the institution of formal marriage among them.

The originator of the Vānara Royal House was Rāṇarāṇ. His origin as well as those of Valmī and Sugrīva are all shrouded in mystery. It is said that born of a drop of tear

that tricked down the cheek of Brahma, Rikṣarāt was deputed to rule over the Vānaras in Kiskindhā. After some time he is said to have plunged into a lake to fight with an imaginary foe. But lo! when he came out of water, he remained no longer a male being, instead he had been translated into an attractive girl. Fortunately there were passing by that way our gallant Indra and the all powerful Sun. Finding that beautiful girl in such a lonely spot, naturally they grew passionate and as the girl did not yield to their embraces easily, the poor souls deposited their semen, one on her head and the other on her neck. Thus were born Valin and Sugrīva from Indra and the Sun respectively (VII—37—A 8ff). Now, this event of a man being changed into a woman is by no means singular. We are at once reminded of the peculiar case of Rājā Sūryumna who having offended Pārvatī by trespassing into her garden, was at once changed into a woman named Ilī. But by favour of Śiva he was again turned into a man. Later on he used to become a man and a woman alternately for a month (Śiva Purāṇa, I 62 13 ff). Similar was the case of the Brāhmana youth Soma Vana, who disguised as a woman is said to have cheated the Queen Śimantini at the desire of the Rājā of Vidarbha. Therefore he too was changed into a woman for good (Skanda III (c) 9 2 ff).

f Vālin (IV—46—3—9) Then when Vālm suspecting foul play on the part of his brother exiled him, in retaliation Vālin is said to have paid him in his own coin by appropriating Sumā, the wife of Sugriva And the wretched Sugriva complains to Rāma in these words

अप्यमूकं गिरिवरं भार्याहरणदु खित ।
प्रविष्टोऽस्मि दुरावरं चारित कारणान्तरे ॥

(IV—10—28)

Being grieved at the forcible appropriation of my wife, I have taken refuge in the Ryamuka hills, because these regions are inaccessible to him (on account of Matanga's curse)

And Rāma having been supplied with the quest, admonished his fallen enemy in these words

तदेतत्कारणं पश्य यदर्थं त्वं मया हतः ।
भ्रातृवर्तसे भार्यायां त्यक्त्या धर्म मनातनम् ॥
अस्य त्वं धर्माणस्य सुग्रीवस्य महात्मन ।
दमायां वर्तसे कामात् स्नुषायां पापकर्मकृत् ॥
तद्वपतीतस्य ते धर्मात्कामवृत्तस्य धानर ।
भ्रातृभार्याभिमर्शोऽस्मिन्दण्डोऽयं प्रतिपादितः ॥
औरसी भगिनी चापि भार्या चाप्यनुजस्य यः ।
प्रचरेत् नरः कामात्तस्य दण्डो ययः स्मृतः ॥

(IV—18—18 ff)

Overstepping the laws laid down in the Religion Eternal, you are guilty of an incestuous sin with your brother's wife, and this was the reason that led me to kill you O sinner, impelled by Desire, you have violated the chastity of the wife of the high souled Sugriva who is your younger brother, for breaking the laws laid down by the religion, this is the punishment that I am pleased to award .

... . Death is the only punishment recommended for

such sinners as violate the chastity of their natural sisters or sisters in law

We frankly confess our inability to follow the line of reasoning advanced by Rāma, remembering the fact that it was his ally, Sugriva, who led the way, and the poor Valm simply followed his footsteps ! Elsewhere he says that he had killed him without giving a previous notice because he was only a शास्त्रामूढ (a monkey) (IV—18—40) Supposing that he was one, how could Rāma exact the moral standard observed by human beings from a monkey ?

Again on the death of Valm, Sugriva once more laid his hands on Tara, and this time permanently, nor did he forget to reclaim his own wife, Ruma On the approach of the autumn season, Hanuman found Sugriva—

ह्यं च पत्नीमभिप्रेतां तारां चापि समीक्षिताम् ।
विहरन्तमहेरात्र कृतार्थं विगतज्वरम् ॥

enjoying the company of his beloved wife and that of the equally beloved Tara, day and night and without annui

Again Sugriva is said to have turned a deaf ear to the reports of the Vanara guards who brought the news of Lakshmana's visit to Kiskindhā Indeed Tara freely admitted the fact in the presence of Lakshmana, when she said—

रामप्रसादात्कोटिं च कपिराज्यं च शब्धतम् ।
प्राप्तवानिह सुप्रियो यमा मा च परतप ॥

(IV-35 5)

O Queller of enemies, Sugriva has earned undying glory, the kingdom of the Vanaras, Ruma and myself through Rāma's favour

Again, the circumstance of Hanuman's birth is also an interesting reading He was, says Jambavan, the natural son of the Wind God and the deputed (क्षेत्रज्ञ) one of Keśari—a Vanara chief, born of the latter's wife Pusjikasthala,

(IV-66-29-30). Hanumān seems to have taken a glory in the fact, for he introduced himself to Sītā in these words :—

तस्याहं हरिणः क्षेत्रे जातो यानेन मैथिलि ।

हनुमानिनि विख्यातो लोके स्येनैव कर्मणा ॥

(V-35-81)

I was born of the wife of Keśari and begotten by Pavana. I am known to the world as Hanumān through my work.

The circumstances of his birth, however, were as follows :—

"The renowned *Āpsarī Puṣpkasthālā* alias *Añjanā* was born as a she—*Vānara* on account of a curse. She was married later on to the *Vānara* chief *Keśari*. One day while, assuming the form of a human being, she was walking about in a leisurely fashion on the top of a hill, the Wind-God gradually removed her wearing apparel made of silk. Then there she stood in all her glory like the Temptation incarnate. It was too much for the Wind God, and the love sick gallant at once violated her. She made a feeble protest against this unseemly conduct of the assailant, but she was soon brought round when promised a son as valiant, intelligent and swift as the God himself. Here it should be noted that the contact is said to have been only mental and not physical. Immediately afterwards *Puṣpkasthālā* is said to have given birth to *Hanumān* in a lonely cave."

(IV-66-8-20)

Certainly in ancient India begetting children "by deputation" was a recognised institution. But the rules pertaining to this custom were rather strict, lest they should run into corruption. *Manu* distinctly says that this system was introduced during the reign of *Vera*, but proscribed very soon afterwards, for it caused confusion of castes. It is for this very reason that he condemns the practice (IX-64-68)

But we know that its death was slow And the Purāṇas preserve numerous cases where children were actually begotten "by appointment" We know that Vāsiṣṭha for the continuance of the Ikṣvaku line, produced the Prince Aśmaka from the wife of King Kalmṣapīda (Vāyu 88-177), that Vyāsa produced Dhṛta rāṣṭra, Pāṇḍu and Vidura from the soil owned by the late King Vicitra Virya (Matsya 50-44 47) The instances may be multiplied

But to my mind the case in hand is one of clear discrimination on the part of Vāyu as well as Añjanē. For who "deputed" Vāyu to produce a child on his behalf? Again, the severest criterion on this system seems to have been that the 'deputed' man should approach the woman devoid of passion, as had actually been done by the Kṣātriya women—after the annihilation of the Kṣātriya males at the hands of Parāśurama (Skanda, V 128 20) But in the present case we are distinctly told that

दृष्ट्वैव शुभसर्वाङ्गीं पवन काममोहितः ।
स तां भुजाभ्यां दीर्घाभ्यां पर्याप्यजत मादत ॥

As soon as the Wind God saw the perfect limbed one, he became love sick and embraced her with his long arms

But though promiscuous in sexual matters, these Vanaras had a keen moral sense that really rouses our admiration While thinking of taking to starvation for having failed to trace the whereabouts of Sita, says the crown prince Angad,

आतुज्येष्ठस्य यो गार्यां जीयतो महिषीं प्रियाम् ।
धर्मेण मातरं यस्तु स्वीकरोति जुगुप्सितः ॥
कथं स धर्मं जानीते ।

The wife of the elder brother should be looked up to like one's mother, and woe be to him—who violates her during the life time of his elder brother. Such a person cannot be credited with the knowledge of the Dharma.

Again when the Wind God had secured her person energetically with his long arms and when the 'soul had met the soul (गतात्मा), the she Vānara Anjana is said to have protested against this unseemly conduct of the all powerful God in these words

एकपक्षीयतमिदं को नाशयितुमिच्छति ॥

(IV 66 16)

who is it that dares violate my chastity ? Again engaged in prying into the harem of Rāvana Hanūman is said to have paid a visit to the drinking house attached to the Palace. There he came across a whole bevy of beautiful girls, the inmates in Ravana's harem sleeping off the intoxication produced by the drink. Naturally they were all lying in a disorderly fashion with their clothes displaced from the proper position. At this sight Hanūman's conscience rebels and he thinks in this strain

परदारापरोपस्य प्रसुप्तस्य निरीक्षणम् ।

इदं कालं ममात्यर्थं धर्मलोपं परिष्यति ॥

न हि मे परदाराणां दृष्टिरियं वयवर्तिनी ।

अयं ध्याय मया हृष्ट परदारपरिमद ॥

The sight of the sleeping inmates of an unknown person's harem would certainly result in a loss of virtue for never have I designed to cast my eyes on the women belonging to others. Besides I saw here one guilty of dishonouring another person's wife. But very soon he recovered the balance of his mind for

कामं दृष्ट्वा मया सर्वा विश्वस्ता राघणखियाः ।
 न तु मे मनसा किञ्चिद्वैरुत्थमुपपद्यते ॥
 मनो हि हेतुः सर्वेषामिन्द्रियाणां प्रवर्तने ।
 शुभाशुभास्ववस्थानु तद्य मे सुव्यवस्थितम् ॥

(V-11-41-42)

Minutely did I see the women of Rāvana, at a time when they did not expect me, but for all that my mind is as pure as ever. The mind is the agent—that moves the senses in producing good or evil conditions and that agent is well in my hand.

Probably this was the reason that led the poet to call him self controlled (आत्मवान् V 1 196 V-61-4) more than once.

The Vānaras also knew how to be grateful. In reply to the severe indictment levelled against Sugrīva by the hot-headed Lakṣmana, Tārā vindicated his character in these words -

नैवारुतन्नः सुग्रीवो न शठो नापि दारुणः ।

नैवानृतकथो वीरो न जिह्मश्च कपीश्वरः ॥

उपकारं कृतं वीरो नाप्ययं विस्मृतः कपिः ।

This lord of the Vānaras must not be taken for an ungrateful, or a deceitful, or a rude, or an untruthful or an insincere being, nor has he forgotten the good turn done him by Rāma.

They also knew how to forget that stern daughter of God-Duty, when steeped in wine and women. And we are told how Sugrīva spent the whole of the rainy season in the company of women without doing anything for Rāma, and it required the Herculean strength of a wrathful Lakṣmana to rouse him from the stupor. Indeed, Tārā defends his conduct in these words,

ममन्त्रे तव बुद्धिरस्ति त्व वै यथा मनुष्यश प्रपन्नः ।

एकालौ हि यथार्थधर्माववेक्षते कामरतिर्मनुष्यः ॥

ममवृत्तं मम संनिकृष्टं कामाभियोगाच्च विमुक्तलज्जम् ।

स्य तावत्परधोरहस्तस्त्वद्भ्रातरं वानरवशनाथम् ॥

पथो धर्मतपोभिरामाः कामानुकामाः प्रतिवदन्मोहाः ।

इं प्रकृत्या चपलः कपिस्तु कथं न सज्जेत सुखेषु राजा ॥

(IV- 33-55-57).

You have been angry with Sugriva finding him attached to pleasure, for you have all along kept yourself strenuously from the Path of Desire, even when men come to lose power of discretion when steeped in pleasure,—and the sages, always engaged in asceticism and religious duties, of desire, are overpowered by sweet Forgetfulness,—why should not this Lord of the Vānaras, by nature so minded, lose himself in pleasure? Therefore, O destroyer of the heroes on the enemy side, it behoves you to use Sugriva who shamelessly follows the path of Desire, devoted to me through passion, even like a brother of your own!

Thus, then, were the Vānaras of old, almost divine in displaying their strength of character and mostly human on the erring side.

Religion—Besides giving the much sought for peace of mind, the religion followed by a certain people goes to bind together the detached members into a homogeneous whole. It comes to supply one of those ties that makes a nation of a certain people. In the case of the Vānaras we are not sure if this seeming side of the utility of Religion played an important part, but we are sure that it went to satisfy the hunger of their hearts and that it supplied the necessary strength wherewith to overcome obstacles.

At the outset it must be told that Vālmiki concerned these Vānaras to have been the children of Aryan Gods. As such it was only natural for them to pour forth the ardent devotion of their hearts at the feet of the gods recognised by the Āryas of old. Thus indirectly it throws some light on the religious beliefs of our forefathers in the Rāmāyana Age.

"Before taking a leap across the sea from the Mahendra Hills, Hanūman is said to have prayed to Sarya, Mahendra Pavana, the Self born One, and other beings worthy of receiving obeisance. Then he is said to have turned to the east and bowed down to his father Vayu' (V-189)

Similarly before entering the Aśoka Park, he is said to have 'prayed to the Self born One Agni, Vayu, Indra who carries the thunder bolt Varuna who carries the noose, the Moon, the Sun, the Asvins the Maruts, the Rsis and the Lord of all Beings for the success of his mission'

(V-13-62-65)

"Before stepping into the gardens, he thinks of saluting the Vasus, the Rudras, the Ādityas, the Aśvin twins and the Maruts (V-13-54)

Then he proceeded to salute Rama, Lakṣmaṇa, Sita, Rūdra, Indra, Yama, Vāyu, Candra, Agni and the Maruts

(V-13-57)

These then were some of the deities worshipped by the Vanaras as well as the Āryas of old. But this list is certainly not exhaustive and it is just possible that there were many more who shared with the above mentioned gods the devotion and attachment of the Vanaras.

Indeed, we are amused to find these Vānaras divided into several religious sects. For instance, we are told that the Vānara chief Ramabha was an ardent devotee of Indra (VI 27-16), then with reference to the Vānara Lord Śata valī,

Suka informs Rāvaṇa that he was a Sun-worshipper (VI-27-44). Thus the seed of the cult of Bhakti was there.

Now we will proceed to describe some of the rites and ceremonies connected with their religion. It has already been noted that they believed in the efficacy of offering water in honour of the departed souls (IV-25-52-53), and that they also gladly followed the lead of the Brāhmanas whose services were in request at the time of religious ceremonies specially. We have seen how they were propitiated by Sugriva on the occasion of his coronation ceremony and how they conducted the religious rites connected therewith (IV-25-14 ff). We also know that Vālin used to visit the four seas daily to perform the Sandhyā prayers and on that occasion we are told that he used to repeat the Vedic mantras (नैगमान्मन्त्रान्) (VII-34-16 18). Again before Vālin went to have the final encounter with his brother Sugriva, Tāra, we know, dismissed him after formally walking round him and performing the auspicious rites (known as the स्वस्त्ययन) in accordance with the prescribed form (IV-16-11-12). Similarly, before Hanūmān took a leap across the sea, the venerable Jāmbavān is said to have encouraged him in these words: "In conformity with the opinion expressed by the Vānara Nestors and by favour of the Rsis, we will all perform the auspicious rites for the success of your mission. Take leap across the sea and we will wait for you on one leg anxiously looking for your return" (IV 67 33-34)

Then, the search party sent to the south under the lead of Aṅgada failing to discover the whereabouts of Sītā, for fear of losing their lives if they returned unsuccessful to Kīṣkindhā, determined to lay down their lives by taking to starvation (प्रायेषपवेशनम्). On that occasion taking leave of one another, each squatted on the sea-coast, on a seat

made of the Kusa grass, the ends of which pointed to the south, with his face turned to the east and having touched water ceremonially (IV-55-20)

The readers' attention here, drawn to the fact that Rāma, too, did exactly the same thing to propitiate the Sea-God before he crossed over to Laṅkā (VI-21-1-11), and we are told that the valiant Parikṣit, too, did the same thing when cursed to die bitten by the Takṣaka (Bhāgavata, 1-19-17)

We propose to take leave of this topic after citing a case of the spirit of religious intolerance displayed by Hanumān on the occasion of his first visit to Laṅkā After discovering Sītā in the Aśoka Park, Hanumān wanted to test the fighting strength of Rāvaṇa So it is represented that he laid waste the fine Park, thus taking the offensive (V-41-1-41) This fact was duly reported to Ravana by the Rākṣas guards of Sītā (V 42 3 5) When opposed by the king's own Kīkara guards, he is said to have destroyed them fighting with an iron bar (V 42 27 42) Next, we are told, he proceeded to demolish the caitya temple of the Rākṣasas which he actually burnt down, and killed the guards (V 43-1 25) I mention this fact because in ancient India, religious persecution was rarely resorted to

चिनीतः, धृतिमान्, मतिमान्, and महान् (III-72-13), illustrious without a parallel, adhering to the truth, humble, patient, intelligent, and great. Again दक्षः, प्रगल्भः, द्युतिमान्, महायत्न-पराक्रमः (III-72 14) and कृतज्ञः, (III-72 14) Elsewhere he is referred to as धर्मात्मा (IV 3 22) religious, विद्वान् (IV-7-25) learned, प्रकृत्या निपुणः बुद्धिमान्श्च (IV 15 14), skilful and wise by nature, रणक्षेत्रविदः (IV 16 19) a skilful soldier, मनस्विन् (IV-29 7), knowing the true sense of the words and आत्मघान् (IV-32-1), self controlled Further on we are told that he was नित्यं पण्डितः (VI 19 36), behaving like a learned man in every day affairs, अदीनसत्त्वः (VI-20 22), high-spirited, प्रियवादिन् (39 4) sweet tongued, सर्वज्ञः (IV 43 2) all-knowing, वाक्यविशारदः (V 63 15), skilful in the use of words, and अर्थवित्तमः (IV 40-15) well-versed in the science of Politics Then Sugriva at one place addressed the Vānara chief Śatavala as अर्थविदांवर (IV 43 5), the Prince of the Politicians Similarly our Poet at o e place speaks of Jāmbavān as अर्थवित् (V 60 14) well versed in the science of Politics He also employs the following epithets to describe him, viz वाक्यक्षेत्रविदः (IV 65 20), skilful in the use of words, महाप्राज्ञः (IV 65 28), highly intelligent, and शास्त्रबुद्ध्या विचक्षणः (VI 17 45), well read in the Śāstras

With regard to Hanumān, we are fortunate enough to have in possession the names of certain definite subjects in which he is said to have attained proficiency To propitiate Vāyu, the Sun god is said to have granted the following boon to Hanumān यदा च शास्त्राण्यस्येन शक्तिरस्य भविष्यति । तदास्य शास्त्रं दास्यामि येन वाग्मी भविष्यति ॥ (VII 36. 4)

When he becomes capable of studying the Śāstras, I shall teach him in such a way that he becomes an elocutionist.

made of the Kuśa grass, the ends of which pointed to the south, with his face turned to the east and having touched water ceremonially (1V-55-20).

The readers' attention here is drawn to the fact that Rāma, too, did exactly the same thing to propitiate the Sea-God before he crossed over to Laṅkā (VI-21-1-11), and we are told that the valiant Parikṣita, too, did the same thing when cursed to die bitten by the Takṣaka (Bhāgavata, 1-19-17).

We propose to take leave of this topic after citing a case of the spirit of religious intolerance displayed by Hanūmān on the occasion of his first visit to Laṅkā. After discovering Sītā in the Aśoka Park, Hanūmān wanted to test the fighting strength of Rāvana. So it is represented that he laid waste the fine Park, thus taking the offensive (V-41-1-21). This fact was duly reported to Rāvana by the Rākṣasi guards of Sītā (V-42-3-5). When opposed by the king's own Kīākara guards, he is said to have destroyed them fighting with an iron bar (V-42-27-42). Next, we are told, he proceeded to demolish the caitya temple of the Rākṣasas, which he actually burnt down, and killed the guards (V-43-1-25). I mention this fact because in ancient India, religious persecution was rarely resorted to

Thus, in the field of religion at least, these Vanaras resembled the Aryans more than in any thing else.

Education—That the Vānaras detested to starve out their brains is amply manifested by the fact that they had culture which was all their own. That they studied divers subjects may be ascertained by a reference to the text. The poet uses here and there different epithets to describe Sugriva—I mean his character and attainments, and here are some of these. We are told that he was अमित्रघ्नः, सत्यसंधः,

विनीतः, धृतिमान्, मतिमान्, and महान् (III-72 13), illustrious without a parallel, adhering to the truth, humble, patient, intelligent, and great Again दत्तः, प्रगल्भः, धुतिमान्, महायल-पराक्रमः (III-72 14) and कृतज्ञः, (III-72 14) Elsewhere he is referred to as धर्मात्मा (IV 3 22) religious, विद्वान् (IV-7-25) learned, प्रकृत्या निपुणः बुद्धिमांश्च (IV 15 14), skilful and wise by nature, रणकोविद् (IV 16 19) a skilful soldier, मनस्विन् (IV-29 7), knowing the true sense of the words and आत्मवान् (IV 32 1), self controlled Further on we are told that he was नित्यंपरिडितः (VI 19 36), behaving like a learned man in every day affairs, अदीनसत्त्वं (VI 20 22), high spirited, प्रियवादिन् (39 4) sweet tongued, सर्वज्ञः (IV 43 2) all knowing, वाक्यविशारदः (\ 6 15), skilful in the use of words, and अर्धविद्वान् (IV 40 15) well versed in the science of Politics Then Sugrīva at one place addressed the Vānara chief Śatavala as अर्धविद्वान् (IV 43 5) the Prince of the Politicians Similarly our Poet at o e place speaks of Jambavān as अर्धवित् (V 60 14) well versed in the science of Politics He also employs the following epithets to describe him, viz वाक्यकोविद् (IV 65 20), skilful in the use of words, महाप्राज्ञः (IV 65 28) highly intelligent, and शास्त्रबुद्ध्या विचक्षणः (VI 17 45), well read in the Śāstras

With regard to Hanāmān, we are fortunate enough to have in possession the names of certain definite subjects in which he is said to have attained proficiency To propitiate Vāyu, the Sun god is said to have granted the following boon to Hanāmān यदा च शास्त्राण्यच्चेनु शक्तिरस्य भविष्यति । तदास्य शास्त्रं दास्यामि येन वाग्मी भविष्यति ॥ (VII 36 4)

When he becomes capable of studying the Śāstras, I shall teach him in such a way that he becomes an elocutionist

Then during the period of Suṅgrīva's exile from Kīṣkindhā, he is said to have "traversed the whole earth, from the Udaya giri to the Astācala urged on by a vehement desire to learn the Vyākaraṇa. In a very short time this matchless Vānara attained perfection in all the branches of this particular subject viz the Sātras, Vṛttis, notes thereon, and the appendices (संग्रहः)' (VII 36 44—45). Consequently we are assured,

न ह्यस्य कश्चित्सदृशोऽस्ति शास्त्रे वैशारदे छन्दमता तथैव ॥

सर्वासु विद्यासु तपोविधाने प्रस्पर्धतेऽयं हि गुरुं सुराणाम् ।

(VII 36 45-46)

nobody excelled him in the knowlengce of the Śāstras, as well as in the Scieoce of the composition of the Vedic mantras (छन्दस्) He could even challenge the preceptor of the Devas in the knowledge of all the Vidyās as well as in the matter of the rites and ceremonies connected with asceticism.

Again, being profoundly impressed with the introductory speech delivered by Hanūmān, on the occasion of his first visit to the exiled princes, Rāma is said to have remarked

नानुग्वेदविनीतस्य नायजुर्वेदधारिण ।

नासामवेदविदुषः शक्यमेव विभाषितुम् ॥

नूनं व्याकरणं कृत्स्नमनेन बहुधा श्रुतम् ।

यद्वा व्याहरतानेन न किञ्चिदपशब्दितम् ॥

(IV 3 28 29)

A man unacquainted with the contents the Rk, the Yajus and the Sāman, cannot speak like that. It is certain that he must have studied the Vyākaraṇa several times thoroughly, for in course of his long speech, he has not misused a single word. Thus we have seen that the Vanaras studied definite subjects with an eye to their utility in the practical field. Here a word about the language used by

them may not be considered irrelevant. It is just possible that at that time in India the mass of the people used the variant forms of Prakrit in their daily life, whereas the learned folk in their formal talks most probably used the refined Sanskrit in conformity with the rules of grammar. For instance, Hanumān on the occasion of his first visit to Sita is in a fix as to the language he should make use of for opening the conversation. He is averse to using the formal Sanskrit lest Sītā should take him for Rāvaṇa in disguise. So he decides (V-30-18)

घाचं चोदाहरिष्यामि मानुषीमिह संस्कृताम् ॥

(V-30-17)

to make use of the colloquial Sanskrit. Thus, I am inclined to believe that the Vānaras too, like others used Prakrit under ordinary circumstances and the formal Sanskrit under special ones. In addition to their being bookish some of these Vānaras were great travellers who had viewed things with their own eyes. We have already seen how Jambavān had tramped round the world full twenty one times when the Devas joined hands with the Asuras to churn the sea in search of the Amṛta (IV 66 32 33). Vālmī, it has been already alluded to above, used to visit the four seas daily for offering his Sandhyā prayers (VII 34 16 18). Again, for fear of losing his life in the hands of Vālmī, Sugriva toured round the four quarters of the globe, and the results of his experiences have been accorded a prominent place in the Rāmāyaṇa (IV 46 10 20). And the knowledge of the wide world he gained then, was utilised by him when he sent out search parties under various Vānara chiefs to discover Sītā (IV-40-43).

Again, these Vānaras were past masters in the act of healing, and as such they were acquainted with the medicinal

properties of numerous herbs and roots. We are told that the Vānara messengers deputed by Hanumān at the desire of Sugriva, on their return journey visited the place where in by-gone days Mahādeva had celebrated a sacrifice on the Himalayas, and brought for their king fruits, roots and medicinal herbs that grew there (IV-37-27-32). Again, when Indra-jit had seriously wounded Rama and Lakṣmana, Suseṇa proposed to send Sampāti, Panasa and others to the Candra and the Droṇa hills in the Kṣīroda sea to fetch the divine herbs, सञ्जीवकरणी and विशल्य, that grew there (VI-50-30-31). Again, when Indrajit had wounded most of the Vānara chiefs along with Rama and Lakṣmana a second time, on that occasion we are told that Jambavan sent Hanumān to fetch four medicinal herbs मृतसञ्जीवनी, विशल्यकरणी, सुवर्णकरणी and सन्धानी from the Oṣadhi hills in the Himalayan regions, that alone could restore the wounded Vānaras (VI 74 29-34). Again on the destruction of Indra-jit, Suseṇa, at the desire of Rama, cured Lakṣmana and other disabled Vānara soldiers of their wounds by applying efficacious remedies (VI-91-20-27). Once more when Ravana out of spite had wounded Lakṣmana with his Śakti dart, Suseṇa directed Hanumān to go once more to the Oṣadhi hills and to get विशल्यकरणी, सावर्ण्यकरणी, सञ्जीवकरणी and सन्धानी for bringing round the younger Prince (VI-101-29-32).

Mode of warfare—Valmiki describes these Vānaras as

शिलाप्रहरणाः सर्वे सर्वे पर्यतयोधिनः ।

नखदंष्ट्रायुधाः सर्वे सर्वे सर्वास्त्रकोपिदाः ॥

(1. 17. 25-26)

fighting with hills and stones, having nails and teeth for their weapons and knowing the use of all weapons. Elsewhere we are told that these Vānaras on reaching Lanka

ते तु वानरशादृताः शादृता इव दंष्ट्रिणः ।
गृहीत्वा द्रमशैलाग्रान् दृष्ट्वा युद्धाय तस्थिरे ॥

(VI-47-45)

stood ready to give battle holding the ends of trees and stones, and he goes on telling this fact and *nauseam*. Further on, Valmiki tells us how they commenced the warfare when Rāma gave the word of command —

"On the word of command having been given by Rāma, every individual Vānara raised a terrific yell impelled by a desire to make a rush. The Vānara chiefs thought of tearing open the town by striking it with huge hill tops and reducing it to pieces with their blows. These uprooting numerous trees, both small and big, climbed on the ramparts of Lankā, in the very presence of Rāvaṇa. Thus those copper faced and gold coloured Vānaras, ready to die for Rāma, made a rush at the walls of Lankā, brandishing their weapons that consisted of the Śāli trees and stones. Then entering the town they began to demolish the ramparts and innumerable porches with huge stones and fists, filled up the trench with dust, hill tops, straw, and wood." (VI 42 10 18)

Thus Vālmiki wants us to believe that these Vānaras were deficient in the use of *शङ्ख* or missiles that could be hurled at the enemy from a distance. When at close quarters, it is unnecessary for us to say, they took to wrestling. We know, for instance, that Vālin fought a wrestling duel with Dundubhi who had assumed the form of a buffalo. Ultimately we are told that having belaboured him mercilessly with his fists, thighs, feet, stones and trees, Vālin killed his antagonist by dashing him on the ground.

(IV-11-40 47)

Similarly the preliminary contest between Vālin and Sugriva was fought mainly with a free exchange of slaps

and fists, till badly wounded, Sugriva gave way and took to flight (IV 12 17 23) Again, in the final encounter, the contest began with boxing Sugriva, then, belahoured Valo with a huge Sal tree Sugriva next was worsted in a wrestling match, during which trees, stones, nails, kicks and slaps were freely exchanged Meanwhile, Rama finding Sugriva driven to the wall, brought down his adversary with a deadly arrow—(IV 16 14 39)

But in this particular branch of fighting, viz wrestling the Vanaras, it seems, had attained great perfection Valmiki happening to give a detailed description of the wrestling contest between Ravana and Sugriva, and the slights and tricks employed by each, really raises our admiration We are told that 'the contest began with free exchange of fists, slaps, kicks and striking with the elbows Then there were throws and falls Next, the one harried with the arm the onslaught of the other, followed by walking in circles in a guarded way Then they advanced a few steps forward and then retreated in a zig zag fashion Lastly we are told how each took recourse to circular movements, hasty with draws, to make the enemy miss the aim, advancing steadily towards the enemy eyeing him all the time, withdrawals after defeats to a corner running towards the enemy, resting the arms on the thighs and doubling the body, striking the enemy at every pace, locking the arms on the breast and extending the arms to hold the arms of the enemy etc' (VI 40 15 26) And need we say that our wrestlers make use of these very tricks till to day ? The Vānaras also knew well the art of boxing and we are told how Angada fought with a Rākṣasa general Vajra Daputra by name, a boxing contest

But it seems that the Vānaras knew the use of arms as well and that they sometimes actually made use of these In

the course of the description of these Vanaras, the poet along with others, uses the following terms, knowing the use of all weapons, like the nectar consuming Devas (1-17 6) "knowing the use of all weapons (1 17 26), Hanūman pays a compliment to his fellow Vanaras when he calls them कृतारता (V 59 8)

Besides, Lakṣmaṇa while going to Kiṣkindhā to see Sugrīva, came across Vanara guards liberally provided with arms, outside the town limits (IV 31 19) again he saw that armed soldiers guarded the gates of Sugrīva's palace (IV 33 17)

Again, later on, we are told how the crown prince Angada killed Vajra Daṁṣṭra after fighting a duel with him with a shield and a broad sword (VI 54 30 14) Further on, we are told how in the course of a duel another Rākṣasa general, Virupakṣa by name cut off Sugrīva's armour (VI 96 26 27)

Amusements—Life is hardly worth living without a loud, lusty laugh! And though our poet does not tell us exactly how our heroes lost themselves in a loud laughter that taking away the cares and worries of this earth, transplanted them for the time being to the bowers of bliss where there reigns eternal beatitude and sweet forgetfulness yet we are in a position to assert that the Vānaras had their own way of amusing themselves

There is no doubt that they cultivated the art of music. During his lonely sojourn on the Prasravana hills, Rāma used to listen to the sweet music of the Vānara minstrels, that came floating on the air from the neighbouring Kiṣkindhā (IV 27 27) Again, Lakṣmaṇa caught the strains of the Vānara music when he entered Sugrīva's harem, and this music, we are told, was serene in its get up as it agreed in keeping time and cadence and rich in ornamentation (IV-33 21)

Again, it has already been alluded to above how steeped in wine and women Sugriva, on his accession to the throne managed to banish from his mind, temporarily at least, the world outside and its concerns. Mention has also been made above as to the way in which Angada and his underlings notified their success in locating the whereabouts of Sita to the dreadful court of Kāśikindhā, (V 61 62)

Position of the she vānaras—Says the great law-giver Manu

यत्र नार्यस्तु पूज्यन्ते रमन्ते तत्र देवताः ।

यत्रैतास्तु न पूज्यन्ते सर्वास्तत्राकलाः क्रियाः ॥ (III 56)

The gods delight in dwelling at a place where the womenfolk are honoured, and where these are treated with scant respect there every thing goes wrong. Unfortunately Vālmiki introduces only two she Vānaras in the course of his narrative. Of these we know Rumā—the wife of Sugriva—only by name, of the other viz Tārā we can say that we know something about her in *extenso*. And though aware of the danger of generalising things from a single instance, we could not check the temptation of rounding off the subject matter of this paper by a brief reference to this point.

Indeed, the high estimation in which Tārā was held by the Vānaras in general, and by Valin and Sugriva in particular, is simply bewildering, and the wonder of all wonders is this that the Aryan poet too shares this admiration for her along with her own people. Vālmiki is unstinted in lavishing suitable epithets to describe her character and attainments. He calls her ताराधिपातमानता (IV-16 1), having a face bright like the moon, प्रियवादिनी दक्षिणा (IV-16 11) sweet tongued, sincere, मन्त्रविद् (IV-16 12), well versed in the Mantras, सती (IV-19 7), a chaste lady, दक्षिरानता (IV-19 15),

having a beautiful face, चारुहासिनी (IV 19 17) sweet smiling, भामिनी (IV 20 2), wrathful, अनिन्यवर्णा (IV 20 26), having a colour that could not be talked lightly of, लोकश्रुता (IV 23 1), well known in the world, चारुनेत्रा, कपिसिंहनाथा, अदीनसत्त्वा (IV 24 26), with beautiful eyes, consort of the lion of the Vanaras high spirited, आर्या (IV 24 29), an honourable lady, मनस्विनी (IV 24 30), intellectual, and सलक्षणा (IV 33 38), carrying auspicious marks Valin who knew her better speaks of her in the following terms — सर्वज्ञा (IV 17 41), the omniscient, तपस्विनी (IV 18 55), leading a religious life

Before expiring, he is said to have bestowed high compliments on her while taking leave of Sugriva

सुखेणदुहिता चेयमर्थसूक्ष्मचिनिश्चये ।

औत्पातिके च चिविधे सर्वत परिनिष्ठिता ॥

यदेवा साधिति प्रयात्वार्यं तन्मुक्तसशयम् ।

नहि तारामत किञ्चिदन्यथा परियच्छते ॥

(IV 22 13—14)

Tārā, the daughter of Susena is well accustomed to look into the springs of all actions is well versed in the science dealing with omens and is skilful in doing everything. What ever action she approves of let that be done without hesitation, for she seldom miscalculates. And the poor Valin came to realise this fact at the cost of his life for before he went out to give the battle to Sugriva Tārā had most solemnly advised him not to go (IV 15 6 30). Again Hanuman, while consoling Tārā on the death of Valin calls her a परिष्ठिता or a blue stocking (IV 21 5). Lakshmana too, sings in the same strain and calls her वार्यतत्त्वज्ञा (IV 33 49), knowing well, the springs of actions. Ananda also uses the following respectful terms to describe her

प्रवृत्त्या प्रियपुत्रा सा सानुमोश तपस्विनी ॥ (IV-55 15)

Naturally of a loving disposition, fond of child and devoted to religious pursuits. Such then was the high regard in which Tarā was held in olden times, and we may not be accused of committing a grave error when we say that the Vanaras, under ordinary circumstances, treated their womenfolk with respect.

And this Tarā, before Valin died, was most solemnly committed to the care of Rama in these words

मद्दोषकृतदोषां तां यथा तारां तपस्विनीम् ।

सुग्रीवो नावमन्येत तथावस्थानुमर्हसि ॥ (IV-18-55)

Be good enough to acquit yourself in such a way that Sugriva might not dishonour her—the pious lady who has been reduced to this pitiable state through my fault !

And how honorably kept !

Conclusion—Such were the Vānaras of old and such was their civilisation. Thus giving a direct lie to the testimony of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa,

ततोऽर्धकामाभिनिवेशितात्मनां शुनां कपोनामपि (I-18-45)

that the Vānaras even like the dogs are devoted exclusively to Artha and Kāma, we actually find that Dharma too equally engaged their attention, and this was the *summum bonum* of life aimed at by the Aryans of old.

Now the last question that awaits solution in this connection, is—who were these Vānaras of old ? There are people who are pleased to call these non Aryans. I remember to have seen the abstract of a paper, published in the Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference held at Madras in this connection. In it the learned writer tried to identify the Vānaras of old with certain aboriginal tribes inhabiting the central parts of C. P. I do not want to pick up a quarrel with the above mentioned scholar, but I would only like to

invite his attention to the fact that Valmiki never intended that his creations should be misconstrued in this way. I am sure that he directly or indirectly, never calls the Vānaras non Aryans. Only once I remember the wrathful Lakṣmana uses the word अनार्य with reference to Sugriva and there the sense is clear. When he says to the Vānara king

अनार्यस्त्वं कृतघ्नश्च मिथ्यावादी च पातर ।

पूर्वं कृतार्थो रामस्य न तत्प्रतिकरोमि यत् ॥ (IV-34-13)

he means to abuse him and अनार्य here does not mean a non-Aryan, but rude or uncivil. Again if you call a spade a spade, it will not be taken as an abuse, and if we perforce apply the sense of non Aryan here then it must be understood that Lakṣmana was conscious of the fact that he was abusing an Arya by using the term अनार्य. On the contrary Valmiki more than once uses the term आर्य with reference to these Vānaras. It is certainly not a euphemism when the poet calls Tārā आर्या (V 24 29), and when Tārā calls Vālin आर्यपुत्र (IV-19 27). Again, these Vānaras were neither अन्नक्षि, nor अन्नक्षि, nor अन्नक्षि: nor अन्नक्षि (see Iyengar's "Life in the Age of the Vānaras"). And if the difference between the Aryas of the Vedic age and the non Aryan Dasyus was not one of race, but of cult alone, then how are we to call these Fire worshipping, and Indra and Brahma worshipping, Vānaras, non-Aryans? Under these circumstances I am strongly in favour of suspecting that these Vānaras were the Vrātyns of the first migration, who had taken to the fresh fields and pastures new of the Deccan on the advent of the Aryans of the second migration, and that they had already been reclaimed before Rāma in the course of his wanderings visited their habitat. But when all has been said about the Vānaras, the fact remains that their tale could not be reconciled with sober history, and here I plead my inability.

IV—A COMPARISON OF THE CONTENTS OF THE RĠVEDA-, VÂJASANEYI-,

TAITTIRIYA—, AND ATHARVAVEDA-(CÂTURA- DHYÂVIKÂ) PRÂTISÂKHYAS

By Mangal Deva Shastri-

It is recognised that the study of the different Prâti-
sâkhyas is indispensable not only to the textual criticism of
the different Vedic Samhitâs but also to the interpretation
of many a doubtful form in their texts. Their importance
to the student of the history of Vedic Grammar which
is represented in Sanskrit literature only by a few more or
less scientific treatises cannot be exaggerated. Similar is the
case if we look at them from the point of view of the history
of Indo-Aryan sounds or Indian phonetics. At least one of
them also affords a good deal of material for the study of
Vedic metre. It is strange that the study of this important
branch of Sanskrit literature, which as its name implies used
to be an essential feature of the courses of study prevalent,
in olden days, in the different branches or *Sâkhâs* of the
learned community in India, has for a long time been
neglected, so much so that even such great writers as Sâyana
and others do not show much familiarity with these works in
their Vedic commentaries. This accounts for the unsatis-
factory state, in many places, of their texts and commentaries.
It is a matter of great satisfaction, however, that these
works so long involved in darkness and obscurity are again
seeing the light of the day through the labours of modern
scholarship.

It is clear that comparative study, in detail, of the
works in question is an essential preliminary for our being
able to arrive at some definite results with regard to the

different studies or sciences related to them. Though it is true that a great bulk of these works is concerned only with a particular Vedic Śāhita, the scientific theories underlying all their treatment are generally the same or at least similar. The standard of development of the different studies represented in them is also, generally speaking, the same. It being so, it is not impossible to draw, from their comparative study, general results which may throw a good deal of light on the scientific and historical study of the different sciences referred to above. In view of these facts a detailed and exhaustive comparison of the contents of the different Prātisākhya, given below, is bound to be of interest to the students of Vedic philology. The general results which can be drawn on the basis of this study will be dealt with in due course in subsequent sections. It must be admitted that something in this direction has been already accomplished by Prof. Whitney in his learned and scholarly editions of the Taittiriya and Atharva Prātisākhya and to a less extent also by Prof. Weber in his Vajasaneyi Prātisākhya. But apart from this material fact that their treatment of this matter is not exhaustive, their comparisons, dispersed as they are throughout the whole books, also cannot be readily used and properly studied.

A few words about the texts used and the references given below are also necessary here. For the Rg Prāt, of course, I have followed my usual method of referring to a Paṭala and to the number of the Sūtra in that Paṭala, and that, too, according to my own edition of the work, which, I hope, will be, before long, in the hands of the public. As for the Vaj. Prāt, unfortunately, owing to their unsatisfactory nature, I could not strictly follow any one of the published texts. The cases where, with regard to reference, I have deviated from Prof. Weber's edition are as follows. In Ch. III my references do not correspond to his numbering

of the Sūtras, as I refer to his Sūtras, 1 (a) and 1 as 1 and 2 respectively and as the Sūtra (ससाद च) 60, according to my reference, is not counted at all by Weber. So is the case with Ch. IV. Weber includes Sūtras 52 and 53 in one Sūtra (52). He numbers Sūtras 58 and 59 as 57 and 57 (a) respectively. An additional Sūtra (115: न द्विक्तम्) is wrongly inserted by him in the text. I may further add that I have referred to Weber's I. 39 and I. 40 respectively as I. 40 and I. 39. In other cases, of course, I have throughout followed Prof. Weber. The references to the Tait. Prāt. and Ath. Prāt. are according to the editions of Prof. Whitney.

As will appear from a careful study of the following comparison, my interpretation of some Sūtras (e. g. Tait. Prāt. XI. 19) is different from that of Prof. Whitney and others. In the interest of brevity I have omitted to point out such differences in the following pages.

The order of various topics given under different heads cannot be said to be strictly scientific in all respects. On the whole they are arranged according to their subject matter, but in some cases, especially when the matter is not common even to any two Prātisākhya, each Prātisākhyā is taken and dealt with separately in the order which is adopted for it in the following table

I: INTRODUCTORY AND EXPLANATORY.

I. Introductory matter :

	Rg. Prāt.	Vāj Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Obeisance to the deity ...	Intro. stanza 1	...	"	...
Nature of the intended work ...	" "
A mystic description of the three kinds of Vedic texts, i. e. Samhitā, Pada and Krama ..	Intro. stanzas 2—4
Requirements of a Vedic Scholar	Intro. stanzas 5, 6, 8	...	XXIV. 5, 6	...
scope of the treatise ...	Intro. stanzas 5—7	I. 1—4	...	I. 1, 2
Relation of the treatise to the general grammar	I. 2
numeration of alphabetic sounds ..	Intro. stanzas 9, 10	VIII. 1—30, 43—46, I. 34

2. Definition of Terms :

	Rg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
समानाक्षर	... I. 1	...	I. 2	Not defined, but used do.
सन्ध्यक्षर	... I. 2	I. 45, VIII. 8-12	...	
स्वर	... I. 3	VIII. 2-13	I. 5	do.
व्यञ्जन	... I. 6	I. 47, VIII. 14- 29	I. 6	do.
स्पर्श	... I. 7	VIII. 15-20	I. 7	do.
अन्ताक्षरा	... I. 9	VIII. 21	I. 8	do.
ऊप्यन्त	... I. 10	VIII. 22	I. 9	do.
अर्धोप	... I. 11, 12	...	I. 12, 13	do.
सोप्यन्त	... I. 13	I. 54	..	I. 10
अनुनासिक.	... I. 14 (also cp. I. 36, XIII. 20)	I. 89 (also cp. I. 75)	II. 30	I. 11

	Rg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
दस	I. 17	I. 55	I. 31-34	I. 59
दीप	L. 18	L. 57	I. 35	I. 61
दस (= a syllable)	I. 19, XVIII. 32	I. 99, VIII. 48, 49	Used, but not defined	I. 93
दु	L. 20, 21, XVIII. 37, 41	XXII. 14	I. 52-54
दरीय	XVIII. 42
दु	XVIII. 38, 39, 43	XXII. 14, 15	I. 51
दरीय	XVIII. 44
द (= a nasal sound)	L. 36
संयोग	I. 37, XVIII. 40	I. 48	Used, but not defined	I. 98
नसि	L. 48	Cp. I. 74, VIII. 28	Cp. I. 78, II. 49, XXI. 12-14	Cp. I. 26, 100
रान (= places of production of sounds)	I. 49	I. 62	II. 31, 33	Used, but not defined

do

I 73-81

Used, but not defined
Used, But not defined, cp III 63Cp V 1,
XXIV 1 4
Used, but not defined cp XX 6, XXII 13

IV 110, 111

Used, but not defined, cp XXIV 6

Used, but not defined, cp IV 88

I 60

I 92-98

I 68-70

I 160 168

II 158

II 2

Used, but not defined, cp I 119

II 3

II 80

VI 33-42

VII 2-1

IV 181

X 12 XI 1

X 12, XI 23

नामिन

प्रगण

रेफिन or रिफिट

सहिता

विद्युत्ति

डिपथि

प्रुय

पटुति (= lengthening of a short vowel)

क्रम (= the Kram : text)

उपस्थित

स्थित or स्थिति	Rg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
...	X.13, XI. 28	...	Not defined, but used, cp. XX. 2	...
स्थितोपस्थित	X.14, XI. 30	I.147
भ्वास	XIII.1	...	II.5	Cp.I.12
नाद	XIII.1	...	II.4	Cp.I.13
वरण (=producing organ or mode of articulation)	XIII.8	Cp.I.11, 43, 90	II.32, 31	Cp.I.18
समापत्त्य	XIII.31	Cp.IV.73, 74, 117
दैव	XIV.1	Not defined, but used, cp. IV.162.
प्रश्न	XV. 23—30, XVIII. 58
अध्याय	XV.31, XVIII 58

उपधा (= a sound preceding a final sound)	Used in a more general sense, but not defined, cp. IV.29	I.35	...	Used, but not defined, cp. III.42
नति (=cerebralization)	...	I.42	...	Used, but not defined, cp. III.42
स्यर्ण	Used, but not defined, cp. I.55	I.43	Cp.I.3,1	...
सिम् (=समानाक्षर)	...	I.14
भायिन् (=नायिन्)	...	I.16
जित् (=खर् of Pāṇini)	...	I.50,51
मुट् (=शर् of Pāṇini)	...	I.52
पि (=घोषयत्; or हश् of Pāṇini)	...	I.53
मात्रा	Cp.I.27	I.56	Used, but not defined, Cp. XXIV.6	Used, but not defined

	Rg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. / Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
सुन (= trumoric prolated vowel) ...	I. 30; also = a दीर्घ vowel, cp VII. 33 etc.	I. 58	I. 36	I. 62
अथु	...	I. 60	Not defined, but cp. XIX. 3	Not defined, but cp. III. 65
परमाथु	...	I. 61
लोप	Used, but not defined	I. 141	I. 57	Not defined, but used, cp. I. 67
आभेदित	...	I. 146	...	Not defined, but used, cp. IV. 40
अपृक्त	Used, but not defined, cp. I. 75	I. 151	I. 54	Not defined, but used, cp. I. 72
संहित	Used, but not defined	I. 155
असंहित	do.	I. 156
अयोगवाह	...	VIII. 23—27
जिह्वामुलीय	Cp. intro. stanza 10 and I. 41	VIII. 25	Not defined, but used	Used for all sounds formed at जिह्वामूल, cp. I. 20.

उपमानोय	...	Cp. intro. stanza 10	VIII. 26	do.	...
अनुस्वार	...	Cp. intro. stanza 10 and I. 21	VIII. 27	do.	Not defined, but used
नित्तर्जनीय	...	do.	VIII. 24	do.	do
यम	...	Op. I. 50	VIII. 29	Cp. XXI. 13	do.
पद	...	Used, but not defined	VIII. 50, 51	Not defined, but used	Not defined, but used
दर्ग (= classes of mutes)	...	Cp. I. 8	Not defined, but used, Cp. I. 49	I. 11	do
प्रथम	...	Not defined, but used	do.	do.	do.
द्वितीय	...	do.	do.	do.	do.
तृतीय	...	do.	do.	do.	do.
चतुर्थ	...	do.	do.	do.	do.
उत्तम (also पञ्चम in Vāj. Prāt)	...	do.	...	I. 14	do.
षोडश	.	do.	...		

	Rg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
अवग्रह	do.	Not defined, but used	I. 19	do.
प्रग्रह (= प्रगृह्य)	IV. 1—54	...
विक्रम (= a kind of अनुदात्त accent)	XIX. 1, 2	...
पद्य (= a पदान्य sound)	I. 3
अभिनिधान (= विसर्जनीय)	I. 12
अभिनिधान (= holding apart of a consonant and suppression of its sound)	Cp. VI. 17	...	Used in a different sense, cp. XIV. 9—11	I. 13
आस्थापित (= अभिनिधान)	Used in another sense, cp. IV. 1	I. 18
संयुक्त (= Combination of consonants not accompanied with अभिनिधान)	Used in the ordinary sense, but cp. VI. 21	...	Used in a different sense, cp. XXII. 15	I. 19, 30
कर्ण	II. 39

III. 63
IV. 73
IV. 117
IV. 125

चिकित्त	...	Not defined, but cp. III. 34
समायसि (= restoration in the Pada and Krama texts)	...	Not used, but cp. XIII. 31
परिहृत
आरुगपि (= संदितायद्वयनम्, cp. Ath. Prāt.)	...	Used in another sense, cp. IV. I

3. Interpretation and application of rules :

	R̥g. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
क्षि added to a sound in representing it	..	I. 36
Use of—क्षि in the name of a sound	...	I. 37	L16, cp. XXII. ⁴	...
Use of—क्षि in the name of a sound	XXII. ⁴ , cp. I. 20	...
But क्षि + क्षि to be added in the case of consonants	...	I. 38	I 17	...
An—क्षि (also) forms the names of consonants	I. 21	...
Vowels also form the names of consonants	...	I. 40
—क्षि is not used in the case of Vi-arjunāya, etc.	...	I 41	Y 18	

एक added to र (instead of -कार)

—ए added to a short vowel

signifies the three vowels

—ए added to a first mute

signifies the series

A short vowel implies both short and long vowels (in certain cases)

१ and २ to be treated as homogeneous vowels¹

Numbers are used with reference to the mutes alone

Significance of the terms-ए, -कार, च, अति, उ, अय, एय, वा and न used in the treatise

...

...

...

Cp. I. 55

...

...

...

I. 39

...

Cp. I. 64

Cp. I. 63

I. 72

I. 49

...

I. 19

I. 20, cp. XXII. 4

I. 27

...

...

...

XXII. 3-8

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

	Rg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Continued implication is of that which was last	I. 58	— ...
A cited theme ending in a (or any other vowel) includes all its cases or other derivative forms	I. 22	...
In case of doubt as to which occurrence of a cited word is intended the next word or part of a word is cited along with it I. 25	...
Or the citation is made of more than one word (in the same case)	I. 26	...
Whatever word is qualified as 'preceding' another word, that word is to be understood in that situation alone	I. 29	...

	Rg. Prāt.	Vñj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
A passage of three or more words, if repeated, is as already established	I. 61
In citation of a word, that word itself (and not a part of a word identical in form with it) is to be understood, even when phonetically altered, or preceded by a- or an.	I. 50—53	...
Unless otherwise stated, parts of compounds treated as words with certain exceptions	I. 61, 62	Cp. I. 153, 154	I. 48	...
A Praśa treated like a Pāda	I. 57
The sound to be changed put in the nominative	I. 56	...	Cp. I. 23	...

Or a word, affected by the change, may be cited without any case

The resulting sound put in the accusative

If a term is used in the locative, the change affects that which (immediately) precedes¹

If a term is used in the ablative, the change affects the initial sound of that which follows²

The genitive case is to be interpreted as meaning 'in the place of'³

I 24

I 28

I 133

I 56

I 134

I 135

I 136

1 Cp Pāṇini, I 1, 66 2 Cp Pāṇini, I 1, 67 and 54 3 Cp Pāṇini, I 1, 49

	Rg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
An increment is designated by the instrumental case	I. 137	Cp. I. 23	...
An increment takes place between two words ¹	I. 138
In case of a single word, however, the increment is made after it	I. 139
An alteration may affect both initials and finals of words or only a single sound	I. 140
Alteration and omission are of a single sound, not of a whole word ¹	Cp. II. 5	...	I. 56
The conversion is to be made according to proximity ² ...	I. 56	Cp. I. 142	...	I. 95

1. Cp. Panini, I. 1, 52 and 54.

2. Cp. Panini, I. 1, 50.

A subsequent mention of words or sounds which are equal in number to those already mentioned is to be taken in the order of their enumeration'	L. 143
In case of doubt as to which ... of the neighbouring and distant words is meant, the reference should be understood to the neighbouring one	L. 144
When both the preceding and following words come under the influence of two rules at the same time the following one is affected (?) ...	Op. V 2. (?)	L. 145

	Ath. Prāt.	Rg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.
In case of opposition of two rules the latter is regarded as more powerful excepting in the case of omission ¹		I. 159
Exceptions to be understood as connected with the general rules	I 53
Irregular formations to be taken with reference to the whole treatise	I 54
...				...
The Sāma vāga Sandhis to be regarded as exceptions	I, 60	
Euphonic modification affects only those initials and finals of words which are seen in the Paṇḍa text ²	II 5	III 3, also cp 1, 3, IV. 117	Cp. X. 25, I 56	Cp. III. 35, 37

¹ Cp Pāṇini, I 4, 2² Cp वृत्तान्तरा, Panini, VIII. 2, 1.

But in certain definite cases a rule may affect even those sounds which are the result of euphonic combination or which occur in the interior of words

Finals of words joined to **क्वि** (in the Pada text) to be taken as they appear without that **क्वि**, and of words not joined to **क्वि** to be taken just as they are ...

A word consisting of only one letter (even if contracted) treated as final and as initial ...

An unrhottacised Visarjaniya with its penultimate treated as one letter in certain cases ...

Cp. VL 16

Cp. IV. 99 etc.

Cp. XIII. 5

Cp. I. 99 ect.

I. 58, 59

...

...

...

II. 6

Cp. I. 152

Cp. I. 55

...

I. 67

...

...

...

	Rg. Prāt.	Vaj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Euphonic combination takes place according to succession of words ...	II. 7	..	Cp. V. 3	Cp III.38
But the cerebralization of a following initial precedes substitution of a final Visarjaniya	V. 2
In cerebralization the cause of cerebralization precedes and the object of the same follows	I 66
A Pluta vowel, followed by i, treated like a long vowel	I. 4

II. PHONETIC.

1. Classification of alphabetic sounds :—

	Rg. Prāt,	Vaj. Prāt	Intt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Monophthongs	...	Cp I 14 (and VIII. 3-6) Do.	I. 2 Cp I 31, II. 18	Cp. III. 42 Cp. I. 37, 38, III. 42 Cp I. 39
i (-earna)	Do.	^{is} Cp I. 87, IV. 146, VIII. 7, 46	Do.	Cp. I. 40
ī (-earni)	Cp. II. 13-17, 23, 26-29 I 5	..
Diphthongs	I 2	I. 45, VIII. 8-12 VIII. 2-13, 13, 46	Cp. I. 3, 31-33, 35 Cp. I 36	Cp. I. 59, 61 Cp. I. 62
Vowels	I 3	Cp. I. 55, 57	...	Cp. Whitney on I. 11.
Short and long vowels	I 17, 18	Cp. I. 58	Cp. Whitney on II. 30	...
Pluta or prolated vowels	...	Cp I. 30, 31
Anusvara is either a consonant or a vowel	I. 5	Cp. VIII. 27

	Rg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt	Ath. Prāt.
Consonants	I. 6	I. 47, VIII. 14-29, 44, 45	I. 6	...
Mutes or Contact Consonants	I. 7	VIII. 15-20	I. 7	...
Five classes of mutes	I. 8	VIII. 15-20, also cp. I. 49	I. 10, 11	...
Semi-vowels	I. 9	VIII. 21	I. 8	...
Breathings (= ऋश्वाः)	I. 10	VIII. 22	I. 9	...
Surd consonants	I. 11, 12 Cp. Uvāta on I. 12	...	I. 12, 13	Cp. I. 12
Sonant consonants	I. 13	...	I. 14	Cp. I. 13
Aspirates	I. 14	I. 54	...	I. 10
Nasal consonants	...	I. 89	Cp. II. 30	I. 11
अथो गणानि:	...	VIII. 23-27

2 Mode of formation of alphabetic sounds

	R _g Prāt	Vij Prāt	Tam Prāt	Ath Prāt
Psychical factor in the production of articulate sounds	XIII 13		Cp II 2	
Physical factors in the production of articulate sounds	Do	I 5-15	XXII 1, 2, XXIII 1-3	
Plurality of alphabetic sounds according to some	XIII 11			
General mode of production of articulate sounds	XIII 1-3	Cp: I. 5-15	II 1-7	
Description of voice, breath and voice-breath	Do	Cp I 11	II 1-7	
Distinction of sord, sonant and sord sonant sounds	XIII 1-7		II 8-11	Cp I
Nature of voice in sonant sounds	XIII 15, 18	..		

	Rg. Prāt.	Vaj. Prāt.	Tutt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
ture of aspiration in aspirate sounds	XIII. 16-19	...	Cp. II. 11	...
ferent degrees of approximation of the organs in the utterance of different sounds	XIII. 8-12	Cp. I. 72	Cp. II. 12-27, 31-34, 44, 45	I. 29-36
ices of production (of articulate sounds) in general	...	I. 10, 30	II. 3	...
ssification of sounds, according to their place (= स्थान) of production	I. 38-51	I 62-71, 73-75, 89
pecial rules for the production of alphabetic sounds with reference to their particular places and organs (= स्थान) of production	...	Cp. I. 75-84	II. 12-30, 33-52	Cp. I. 18-28

Definition of <i>ṣṭra</i> and <i>ṣṭra</i> in the case of vowels and consonants respectively	II. 31—31	...
Production of a nasalized sound	XIII. 50	I. 75	II. 52	I. 27
Nature of <i>Anu-ṣṭra</i> according to <i>Vyākṛ</i>	XIII. 37	...	Cp. II 30	...
Manner of right pronunciation of vowels in <i>general</i>	XIV. 65, 66
Nature of <i>r</i> <i>varṇa</i> and <i>ṣ</i> <i>varṇa</i>	XIII. 31, 35	IV. 116	Cp. Whitney on II. 18	I. 37—39
The mode of nasalization of <i>r</i> <i>varṇa</i>	I. 71
Nature of diphthongs	XIII. 38—41	Cp. I. 73, IV 113	IV 16. 13—17, 23, 26—29	I. 40, 41
Right pronunciation of conso- nants in <i>general</i>	XIV. 67

	Rg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prot.	Taitt. Prat.	Ath. Prat.
Nature of ! (ॐ) and lh (ॐ) sounds	I. 52	Cp. IV. 144, VIII. 45	Cp. Whitney on XIII. 16	...
Opinions of various authorities as to the degree of nasality in different nasal sounds	XVII. 1—4	...
General mode of correct utter- ance	XVII. 7, 8, XXIII. 20	...

3. Quantity:

	Rg Prāt.	Vñj. Prāt.	Tatt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Quantity of short, long and prolotted vowels	I 27, 29, 30	I. 55—58	I. 31-33, 35, 36	I. 59, 61, 62
Quantity of a nasalized vowel according to Old Kauṇḍinyā	XVII 5, cp. Gūrgya Gopāla	Cp. I. 53
Quantity of consonants	I 31	I. 59	I. 37	I. 60
" " Anusvāra preceded by a short or long vowel	XIII. 32, 33	IV 118, 119	Cp. I 31	...
" " syllables (heavy and light)	I. 20, 21, XVIII 37-39, II, 43	Cp IV 107	XXII 14, 15	I. 51—54
" " syllables (heavier and lighter) ..	XVIII 42, 41	..	XXII. 13	..
" " Aṅgrāṇa	I. 28	V. I		

	Rg Prāt.	Vāj Prāt	Tatt Prāt	Ath Prāt
Quantity of Svara bhakti	I 33, 35	Cp IV 16, 146, 147	Cp XXI 15	I 101, 102
" , स्फोटन				I 103
Duration of voice called ध्रुव which follows a sonant अभिनिधान	VI 39			
Duration of breath and voice	XIII 7			
" , hiatus	II 4		XXII 13	
Length of different kinds of pauses			XXII 13	
Quantity of Om	XV 5	II 51	XVIII 1	
Different quantities of substi- tuted sounds		IV 147		
Nature of sounds having one, two, or three moras illustrated	XIII 50			

4. Accent

	Rg Prāt	Val Prāt	Tutt Prāt	Ath Prāt
General character of acute, grave and circumflex accents	III 1, 2, 3	I 31, 32, 108—110	I 38—40	I 14—16
A consonant shares the accent of its vowel	Cp III 2	I 107	Cp I 43	
Mode of production of acute and grave accents	Cp III 1	Cp I 31	XXII 9, 10	
Details respecting the title and circumflex	III 4—6	I 126	I 41—47	I 17
Nature of enclitic circumflex	III 7	Cp IV 135	Cp XIV 29	Cp III 67, 68
" " natural or constant (अस्य, तुत् Prāt निय) circumflex	III 8	I 111	XX 2	III 57
Acute resulting from coalescence of two vowels	III 11 16	IV 129, 130, 132	X 10, XII 10, 11	III 66

	Rg Prut	Vij Prāt	Entt. Prāt.	Ath Prāt.
Circumflex as the result of combination of two syllables into one	III 12-14	IV 47, 61, 62, 129-131, 133, 134	X 12, 16, 17, XII. 9	III. 55, 56, 58-61
Circumflex instead of a grave following an acute	III. 17	IV. 135-137	XIV 29-33	III. 62, 63, 67-70,
Names' (and nature) of different kinds of circumflex (enclitic or independent) resulting from euphonic combination of syllables	III 18	I 112-120	XX. 1, 3-8	III. 55, 56, 58-63
कण्ठ or depression in four kinds of circumflex	III. 34	IV 135	XIX. 3-5	III. 65

1 The different Pr t-akhyas differ as to the number and order of the names as follows —

Rg Prut —कण्ठ, होरोव्यञ्जन, क्षेप, अमिनिर्दिष्ट and प्रसिद्ध,

V j Prut —अमिनिर्दिष्ट, क्षेप, प्रसिद्ध, होरोव्यञ्जन, लोभेविगम, वाग्वृत्त, and राधाभास्य, (? cp, Uvata);

Tait Prut —क्षेप, प्रातिदल, अमिनिर्दिष्ट, प्रसिद्ध वाग्वृत्त and होरोव्यञ्जन,

Ath Prut —अमिनिर्दिष्ट, प्रसिद्ध, क्षेप, होरोव्यञ्जन and वाग्वृत्त.

	Rg. Prāt,	Vaj. Prāt.	Tnaitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Different opinions as to the accents allowed in recitation	I. 127—132
Defects in the utterance of accents	III. 29—33
Movements of the hand indicating differences of accentuation of words in recitation	...	I. 121—125
Accent of Om	...	II. 51	XVIII. 2, 3, 5—7	...
" " the Upasargas	...	Cp. VI. 24
Enumeration of unaccented words in the beginning of a Pāda in the Rgveda	...	XVII. 27—35
Unaccented Pādas in the Rgveda	XVII. 36
A special case of accent	I. 96

Paribhas regarding accentuation of words
Every word excepting that which has a circumflex has an acute !

The rest of it is grave !

सर्वांशदात्त words

Exceptions

आद्युदात्त words

द्वयुदात्त words

त्र्युदात्त words

सर्वांशदात्त words

अन्तोदात्त words

II 1

II 2

II 3—18, 52,
33 63

II 19—21

II 22—42, 64

II 46—48

II 49

II 50, 51

II 54—62, 64

Ath. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt	Vāj. Prāt.	Rg. Prāt.	
...	...	VI.1, 11—23	...	Accentuation of verbal forms ...
...	...	VI.2—10.24 Upasargas (in a compound or sentence) ...
:		.		
:				

5. Syllabication :

Ath. Prāt.
I. 55—58, 104Tnitt. Prāt.
XXI. 1—9Vij. Prāt.
I. 99—106Rg. Prāt.
I 22—26, 32,
XVII. 32—36

....

Division of syllables

	Rg Prāt	Vaj Prāt	Taitt Prāt.	Ath Prāt.
The three <i>sthānas</i> ¹ or qualities of utterance ...	XIII 12	Cp I 10, 30	XXII 11, cp XXIII 5, 10	
The seven <i>sthānas</i> ² or qualities of utterance			XXIII 4—10	
The seven tones or notes (= <i>yamas</i>)	XIII 12—13	Cp I. 127	XXII 12, XXIII.11—19 ³	
The three notes (= <i>critas</i>) ⁴ of speech	XIII 16—19	
The quality of Om ...	Cp XV 3		XVIII. 4	..

¹ मन्त्र मन्त्रम् उच्यते (or मन्त्र) ।

² हविर्ग वज्रग, निमग, उपदिशन्, मन्त्र, मन्त्रम्, मन्त्र ।

³ मन्त्र (or मन्त्र), मन्त्र द्वितीय, तृतीय, चतुर्थ, मन्त्र. अतिमन्त्र । Cp. also Utaśa on Rg Prāt XIII, 44 & Vaj, Prāt, I, 127.

⁴ विच्छिन्ना, मन्त्रम्, मन्त्र ।

(To be continued)

Then followed the Humanistic Realism. This was an attempt to lay emphasis upon the study of Nature, of man and of social institutions. But the upholders of this view believed that this could be done best only through the study of the life, writings and investigations of the ancients. The Realistic Humanists gave much wider significance to the narrow conception of education of the pure Humanists; but they, nevertheless, maintained much of the old in as much as they held that nothing nobler and greater or higher than what the ancients had accomplished was possible. Thus 'if military science was to be studied, it could in no place be better searched for than in Caesar and in Xenophon, was agriculture to be practised, no better guide was to be found than Virgil or Columella, was architecture to be mastered, no better way existed than through Vitruvius, was geography to be considered, it must be through Mela or Solinus, was medicine to be understood no better means than Celsus existed, was natural history to be appreciated, there was no more adequate source of information than Pliny and Seneca'*

The subsequent period was a period of extreme change which began initially under the Reformation. With the spread of Sense Realism we get for the first time the formulation of a general theory of education based upon rational rather than upon empirical ground. The old practice of counting one's educational advancement in terms of 'memory activities' was completely overthrown and was supplanted by a new conception which was derived from the fundamental belief that knowledge comes primarily through the senses, that education is consequently founded on a training in sense perception and not in memorising facts of books

* Monroe . A text book in the History of Education, page 444

that will be serviceable in most dissimilar experiences or activities, that will be available in every situation, that will be applicable to the solution of problems presented by a subject, however remote in kind from the one furnishing the occasion for the original disciplinary experience.' It was further believed that the study of subjects such as mathematics and logic and classical languages developed the memory and the reasoning faculty. Grammar was given importance as it was supposed to develop accuracy and precision. The special demands of the professional and technical studies were to be given no consideration, as 'the powers of the mind' once developed by the study of a few selected subjects would spread to and affect all the situations of life, and all that was needed was to direct the ability generated by the formal training of the school into the desired channel.

Many interesting experiments have been made during the past few years on this question of 'spread'; and it has been proved beyond doubt that there is not much truth in it and the study of a particular subject cannot necessarily be useful in other subjects also. Thus the habit of inductive reasoning of the scientist cannot be of any use to him in his linguistic activities where a different method of work is demanded, nor can he be expected to fulfil the function of an artist on the ground that he happened to be very good at his experiments once. Careful observations have been made to determine whether the habit of 'producing neat papers in arithmetic will function with reference to neat written work in other studies and it has been found that there was not the slightest improvement in language and spelling papers, although the improvement in the arithmetic papers was noticeable from the very first'.* Yes, the 'spread' from one subject to another is possible if

they are similar and allied, and the degree of success in the study of a subject on the strength of the knowledge of another subject will be in direct proportion to the extent to which the former can be associated with the latter

While studying the Ancient Indian Literature it came to my mind to find out whether the ancient Indian educators of our country have to say anything regarding this doctrine of Formal Training. It was really surprising to find recorded in clear words an opinion which the modern psychologists could arrive at only recently. Thus while emphasising the need of the study of the *Niti Śāstra* Śukrāchārya says —

‘ Other Śāstras treat of certain specialised branches of human activity (and hence can be useful in a limited sense) *

‘ But one who studies only one Śāstra cannot decide upon any course of action. The intelligent man, therefore, should inspect many sciences and always study many Śāstras †

And while talking about Grammar, Logic, Philosophy and the Science of rituals, practices and ceremonies, he says —

These sciences, moreover, treat only of the topic specially assigned to each (and give the truth about them only), and hence are always cared for and mastered by such persons only as have need for those teachings (i.e. whose knowledge and occupation require a knowledge of those truths)

Here we find a clear disparaging of the Doctrine of Formal Training. The one sidedness of the mind due to the study of only one branch of knowledge and the inability and

* Śukranīti—18

† Śukranīti—1-18-19

the unfitness of the grammarians, logicians, philosophers and experts in Karma Kāṇḍa to apply the power of their learning to a subject which is not familiar to them is a clear proof of the great Rā's clear vision of the futility of the belief that the power and discipline of the mind acquired from the study of one subject could spread to and be available for other subjects also. And consequently while mentioning the qualifications of an official of the state he demanded with an equal amount of proficiency the knowledge of all the sciences which were required in virtue of the office he was to hold, and does nowhere urge the supremacy of any one subject or a group of subjects over other subjects as conferring upon the student powers of intellect and wisdom which could help him in all the situations of life. The special requirements of the professional and technical studies which would qualify a man for some particular profession in the society or for some particular office in the service of the state, did not fail to attract his attention and make it clear to him that they had their own place, own method and own principles in education and could in no way be made subordinate to, or understood as by products of, other sciences. Thus while speaking about the education of the princes he says —

‘He (the king) should make the children of his family well up in the Niti Śāstra, proficient in archery, capable of undergoing strains and of hearing harsh words and punishments, habituated to the feats of arms, master of all arts and sciences, upright in morals as well as disciplined through his ministers and counsellors’*

* Śukraniti—II, 43-46

See also Kadambarī. The prince Chandrapāla was given a training in 16 various sciences including carpentry, ivory work, &c

And about the qualifications of an ambassador he says —

‘That man is chosen as ambassador who knows the innermost feelings of other men, who can study their expressions and emotions (Psychology), who has a good memory, knows the conditions of time (History) and place (Geography), can speak well and is fearless *

And about the qualifications of the commanders and the soldiers of armies he says —

Those who are well up in Nisāstras, the use of arms and ammunitions, manipulations of battle arrays, and the art of management and discipline, who are not too young but of middle age, who are brave, self controlled, able bodied, always mindful of their own duties, devoted to their masters, haters of enemies, should be made commanders and soldiers, whether they are Śādras or Kāttīyas Vaiśyas or descended from Mlechchhas †

He gave no consideration to the special capabilities or incapacities of the students on the ground that the discipline of their formal training would make them fit for every obligation that life made upon education and those of them that were in a position to undergo that training were considered unfit for the higher offices or functions or to receive the privileges and distinctions which would otherwise have been due to them Śukrāchārya knew well the hollowness and falsity of such a belief and

*See also Kīdambari, II 174—175 See also —

(1) Matsya Purana, pp 219, 223 &

(2) Kautilya Artha Śāstra, Chapt VIII

†Sukranīti, II 276—280

advises his people that a great skill and discrimination is required in selecting proper men for the state or even for private business, that for the well being of the society and for the success of organisations it was imperative that the special aptitude of the people should be taken into account, and that they should be given work which is in harmony with the line of their special proficiency. While finishing his advice on the topic, he comes to a very important educational principle which at once shows the psychological achievements of the ancient Indian educators. He says that every individual, whoever he may be and however incapable he may prove himself in his ordinary dealings in the society, has always got some special line of interest which he has selected for himself, and has therefore acquired in that line some proficiency which distinguishes him as a fit man for the corresponding work, exactly in the same way as every letter of a mantra has its own importance and every plant has got its own medicinal value. The wise is one who has the eyes to see the special powers of the individuals, the method to develop those powers and the wisdom to make use of them. Thus we find —

* There is no letter (of alphabet) which bears no charm, there is no root (of plant) that possesses no medicinal properties. So also there is no man who is (utterly) unfit. But the remedy is the person who can connect.*

According to him every branch of knowledge was to be respected and the king was expected to extend his patronage to all the learned men, irrespective of the science they professed to know. Even the knowledge of Mantras and

* Sukraniti—II, 254—255.

See also footnote page 77, Sukraniti Panini Office publication, Allahabad

ras entitled the persons to distinctions and aids of the
equally as that of Śruti. Thus we find :—

Those who practise penances, those who are charitable,
e who are proficient in revealed literature (the Vedas)
Smṛti, those who are well versed in Purāṇas, those
know the Sūtras, the astrologers, the sorcerers, those
are masters of Āyurveda (medical science), those who are
sed in the religious rites and ceremonies, those who
ctise the virtues laid down in the Tantras and those
vers who are meritorious, intelligent and masters of their
ssions—these classes of men the king should worship and
aintain by stipends, gifts and honours *.

It is now obvious that the learned Rṣi was perfectly
ear on the point that the study of a particular subject could
it help that of another. But at the same time there is
mple proof to show that he was not an extremist like
uxley or Spencer who laid the whole emphasis on the
onten s of study. He believed fully that there was a spread
f mental powers from one subject to another if there were
common elements or features. Thus in praising the utility of
Nīti Śāstra he makes it obligatory for every individual of the
society, who wished to promote his socio economic interest, to
have a careful study of it on the ground that it was a system
of moral philosophy extracted in the form of an essence, as
it were, from the entire mass of social, economical and politi-
cal experiences and knowledge of man and compiled in the
form of a systematic science on the art of living, equally
applicable to all irrespective of the department of activity in
life. When side by side with this he mentions that all
Śāstras have a limited usefulness, being adapted to special
purposes and not meant to be of universal interest to man
as such he makes his views still clear. Thus we find —

'Niti Śāstra conduces to the desires and interests of all and hence is respected and followed by all' *

Are these sciences (Grammar, Logic, Philosophy, etc) of any use to persons following their ordinary affairs or avocations in supplying them with skill and intelligence? But on the other hand without Niti the stability of no man's affair can be maintained just as without food the physical body of man cannot be maintained and preserved †

"The Niti Śāstra that is common to the king and the common wealth (people) has been narrated in brief This remembered by the king is useful to him ‡

Even in an age as old as that of Chandra Gupta Maurya it was clear to the Hindu mind that the problem of education was a complex one and that if it was intended that it should be of some practical use to man it was to be made to make ample provision for all the departments of life Kaṇṇya strongly opposes the view of his predecessors who held that the study of two sciences, Vartā (agriculture, cattle breeding and trade) and Danda Niti (science of Government) were sufficient to meet all the demands of life and all the other sciences had their origin and end in these § He urges that there were a few primary sciences each fixed in response to a particular demand of the human nature and intended for a particular purpose in the human life Thus there was the spiritual life of the individual and it was to be developed and perfected by the study of the philosophy of religion and the practice of Yoga Then there were the

* Śukraniti I, 23-24

† Śukraniti II 20-24

‡ " III 652-653

§ Kaṇṇya Artha Śāstra, Chapter II

problems of the moral and the social life which were to be fostered and regulated by the study of the Vedas. The physical requirements of life such as wealth, riches, worldly enjoyments and pleasures were also to be given full consideration and for that the individual was taught Vārtā (agriculture, cattle breeding and trade). And finally lessons on practical wisdom were to be given to promote efficiency, prudence and control by prescribing a course of Daṇḍanīti (science of government)*. No where is there even the slightest hint to give preference to any one of these sciences over the rest. Each had its own importance and purpose in education.

And when we find that the ancient Indian Rā is constantly exhorting the teachers to secure a thorough training of the organs of the sense of the pupils and to make education intensely practical by making them act strictly according to the precepts of the Śāstras taught to them we are at once convinced of the fact that the ancient Indian education was more of a sense realist, or I should say, of a psychologist than of a 'disciplinarian'. We find —

* Absence of discrepancy in the perception of sound, touch, colour, flavour and scent by means of the ear, the skin, the eyes, the tongue and the nose is what is meant by the restraint of the organs of sense. Strict observance of the

• Kautilya Artha Śāstra Chapter II and IV. He (King) should learn the threefold knowledge (of the Vedas) from those who possess the knowledge thereof (Vedas), and (and of) policy, logic, and knowledge of Self, but business from the people. Manus VII 43. Obviously for Manu the knowledge of the Vedas etc. could not help a man in learning the science of business. The king should learn the Vedas, Politics, Logic, Philosophy, and Temporal Science. He should collect information from ordinary people and keep his senses under control. Matsya Purāṇa, ccxv 53—55.

precepts of sciences also mean the same, for the sole aim of education or all the sciences is nothing but restraint of the organs of sense' *.

Yes, there is a passage in the Kautilya Artha Śāstra which may well be urged against this statement and may be taken as an indication of the Rāj's disciplinary conception of education. He says at one place that 'when seen in the light of these sciences, the science of *Anvikṣikī* (Philosophy of Sāṅkhya, Yoga and Lokayata) (Atheism) is most beneficial to the world, keeps the mind steady and firm in weal and woe alike, and bestows excellence of foresight, speech and action. Light to all kinds of knowledge, easy means to accomplish all kinds of acts and receptacle of all kinds of virtues is the science of *Anvikṣikī* ever held to be †

A little reflection will show that so far as the modern views regarding the Doctrine of Formal Training are concerned he may well be classified with the modern educators rather than with the old 'disciplinarians'. We have seen that observations have proved that the transfer of mental powers from one sphere of mental activity to another is possible to the extent there are points of similarity between them. The strength of will, the power of concentration and volutary attention the nervous control and the freedom from emotions, passions and excitements which one acquires by the practice of yoga, or the serenity of thought and the sublimity of ideals, the awareness of the workings of the modes of *Prakṛti* and hence of the body and the mind itself,

* Kautilya Artha Śāstra, Chapter VI

See also the Introduction by S M Mitra to 'Hindu mind Training by an Anglo-Saxon mother—Longmans, Green & Co

† Kautilya Artha Śāstra, Chapter II

the knowledge of the infallibility of the Law of Karma, the cognisance of the relation between Prakṛti and Puruṣa which are the fruits of the study of philosophy and metaphysics are in fact the requirements of man as man and become on that account the unavoidable accessories of his worldly existence equally serviceable in all the walks of life and equally applicable to all the phases of human activity.

Finally, when we find the ancient Rṣi prescribing to the students a universal Code of Dharma* and making it obligatory for each of them to study and follow that Code not as a part of any special professional or technical studies, but as a collection of precepts fixed for the good of man as man†, and again when we find them saying to the students that Dharma is to be followed and adhered to for the sake of Dharma,‡ we can beyond doubt, say that they reached very nearly to the most modern views regarding the problem. This cannot better be explained further than by quoting a passage from Professor Dunville's 'Child-Mind', in which he says —

‘Further it is to be remembered that there are elements which can be made to permeate the whole of life ideals, purposes, aspirations or ambitions. Moral instruction and training, for instance, whether undertaken at specific times or only incidentally in connection with various lessons, is

• Yājñavalkya Smṛti	Chapter II
Gobhila Grhya Sūtra	Chapter on Studentship
Manu	Chapter II
Vṛata Smṛti	Chapter on Duties of a householder
Āpastamba and Gautama	Chapter on Studentship
† Matsya Purāṇa	c xli 3-4.
Vṛata Purāṇa (Wilson)	Book III Chapter IX
‡ Bhagavad Gītā	Chapter III

not given with a view to excellence in one particular branch of activity ; we want it to have an effect on the whole of life. It is true that such a habit as that of neatness may develop within a certain subject (e. g. arithmetic) and show no signs of spreading to other subjects (e.g. written composition). But if the mere habit is based upon an ideal ("whatever is worth doing is worth doing well") consciously accepted by the individual concerned, it will tend to spread to other subjects.

VI—HISTORY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY OF NYAYA VAISESIKA LITERATURE

Continued from Vol. IV, p. 70

BY GOPI NATH HAVIRAJ

V—HARIDĀSA NYĀYĀLANKĀRA BHATṬĀCHĀRYA

Of all the Commentaries on the *Kārika* portion of the *Kusumāñjali* the one by Haridāsa, a man of Nadia, has undoubtedly gained the widest currency in Bengal. And it is as the author of this popular annotation of the *Kārikās* rather than for any other works, that he is remembered by the modern Pandits of Bengal and Mithilā.

If the tradition* recorded by Mm Chandra Kanta Tarkālakāra in the Preface (p i) to his Commentary on *Kusumāñjali* Haridāsa (Śaka 1516) regarding Haridāsa's journey to Mithilā for the study of *Nyāya Śāstra* and his return home with the whole of the *Kusumāñjali* (including the prose portion also) in his memory be authentic, the event certainly marks an episode of supreme historical interest in the study of philosophy in Bengal. For it inaugurated studies and speculations, and inspired literary activities which have continued into the present day.

To what time Haridāsa should be assigned is a question to which no final answer can be given at present. It is sure that he was earlier than Śaka 1521 or 1599 A D when a Ms of his Commentary on the *Ālōka* was transcribed and the earlier limit of his age is the date of *Ālōka* itself. I am disposed however to take him as a pupil of Vasudeva Sarvabhauma.

* But see *Navadvīpa Mahima*, p. 67

Among his contributions to the philosophical literature of the country the following are known

A Commentaries on

(a) Udayanāchārya's

1 Kusumāñjali Kārikās

(b) Gaṅgeśa's

1 Tattva chintamani (=प्रकाश)*, and

(c) Pakṣadhara's

1 Tattva chintāmanyaśloka†

VI JĀNAKINĀTHA BHATTĀCHĀRYA CHŪDAMANI

Another writer who has had a large number of commentators and wielded great influence on Contemporary thought was Jānakīnātha, more popularly known as 'Bhattachārya Chūdāmaṇi'. His most famous work was न्यायसिद्धान्तमञ्जरी, in which he quotes Śivaditya, p 23, Chintamanikṛt, p 217, Nyayabhāskarakṛt, p 223 and Muraṇ Mīśra, p 285, and mentions by name his two earlier treatises, viz (a) मणिमरीचिनिबन्ध (Ny Si Man) pp 18, 185), probably a commentary on Tattvachintamani and (b) तात्पर्यदीपक (p 185)

VII —RAGHUNĀTHA ŚĪROMANI

After Vasudeva the philosopher that calls for special notice here is the great Raghunātha variously styled Śīromani, Tarkika Śīromani or Tarkika Chūdāmaṇi. He was the

* Sastri's Report 1893-1900, p 15 Peterson, VI, no 218, p 16

† Mitra's Notices, Nos 2850-2852. The three Mss dealing with the three sections of the work viz प्रत्यक्ष अनुमान & शब्द were copied by one Kandarpa Ray on the bank of the Ganges (स पुनर्विधे) in Śaka 1523 (त्रिपुरमविशिष्टक्षणराधिनये), 1522 and 1521 respectively

greatest figure in Nadia, and next to Gangeśa the greatest in the field. His studies ranged over a wide area, and his philosophical speculations were as deep as they were varied.

The story of Raghunātha's life is not known in detail. He was born in a very humble Brahman family of Pañchakhaṇḍa in Sylhet (Assam), where his ancestor Śrīdhara Āchārya had migrated from Mithilā in 53 Tripura Era (=643 A. D.) and settled. On the death of his father, Gobinda Chakravartī, at an early age the family was thrown into hopeless confusion. There was no earning hand in the house. The burden of expenses fell on Raghunātha's mother, Sita Devi. But how long could the poor widow manage it? She soon found herself in great straits. It is said that at this time a batch of pilgrims from her village was setting out on a holy trip to Navadvīpa for a dip in the Ganges. Sita Devi, with her infant son, felt inclined to accompany this party—which she did, but before they could reach Nadia Sita fell seriously ill and was deserted by her companions. Upon recovery, she resumed her journey and reached her destination in the company of a kind merchant of the place. At Nadia Sita took shelter with the great Vāsudeva Sarvaśhaṇḍa who received Raghunātha into his favour and began to teach him with great care.

It is said that in his early life he had been a student of Vāsudeva. But later on he went to Mithilā in order to study the knotty points of Nyāya Śāstra with Pakṣadhara whose reputation of scholarship attracted him. He is said to have been blind of an eye, and so the tradition runs that when he stood in presence of Pakṣadhara eager to sit at his feet and drink at that fount of learning of which he had heard so much talked, the latter being struck by his odd look, questioned him thus

आपण्डितः सहस्राक्षं विरूपाक्षत्रिलोचनः ।

अन्ये द्विलोचनाः सर्वे को भवानेकलोचनः ॥

At this query of Pakṣadhara Raghunātha was much annoyed at heart, but he was not to be daunted. He retorted readily "He who is capable of giving an eye (power of vision) to the eyeless is to be considered a real teacher, while the rest are mere names (तदन्ये नामधारिणः)"

On his return from Mithilā with the laurels yet fresh upon his head Raghunātha won a great name in the country. Students from various parts gathered round him and listened to his learned discourses.

He wrote in the course of his teacher's life a series of works including numerous commentaries and an original treatise dealing with philosophy,

A Commentaries on

(a) Udayana's

1. Ātmatattvaviveka (=दीपिका or बोद्धधिकार विवृति)*
(Stein p 135),

and 2. Nyāya kusumanjali

(b) Śrī Harṣa's

1. Khaṇḍanīkhaṇḍa Khadya (=दीधिति),

(c) Vallabha's

1. Nyāyalīlavatī. This is identical with (e) 2

(d) Gaṅgeśa's

1. Tattvachintamāni (=दाधिति),

* There are two old Mss of Raghunātha's Commentary on Ātmatattvaviveka in the Govt Sanskrit Library Benares—one (called erroneously in the Colophon भावप्रकाश) dated Śaka 1538 and Samvat 1672 (= 1616 A. D.) and the other dated Śaka 1516 (= 1594 A. D.)

and (c) Vardhamāna's

1. K raṇāvaliprakāśa (दीधिति or विमूति or विवृति),
- and 2. Njāyāhāvatiprakāśa.

B And an original tract, called

- (a) पदार्थतत्त्वनिरूपणम्, variously called पदार्थसङ्गटनम्
& पदार्थतत्त्वविवेचनम्

Among the above treatises the commentary on Chintāmaṇi, known as मणिदीधिति, has been justly the most successful and popular. Since its publication this work has driven all the venerable old commentaries out of fashion, so much so that the very names of works like Āloka (by Pakṣadhara) and Prakāśa (by Ruchidatta) are now well nigh forgotten. The whole host of later writers drew upon him for their inspiration.

Raghunātha was a bold, subtle and original thinker, and it would seem from the words used in the Dīdhiti that he was a bit too highly conscious of his own powers. Cf

विदुषां निवर्तयन् देकमत्याट्टं यददुष्टं यच्च दुष्टम् ।
मयि जहति कल्पनाधिनाथे रघुनाथे मनुतां तदन्यथैव ॥
(End of अनुमानदीधिति)

He declares that his commentary on Chintāmaṇi embodied the essence of various Sāstras (सारं निर्णयं निखिलसङ्ग्राहणं) drawn out by study (अध्ययनं) and contemplation (भाषना).

Raghunātha had unquestionably a real gift for poetical expression rare among the logicians of the Middle Ages. The well known verse

कान्तेषु वीरमलधियो ययमेव नान्ये
तर्षु वीरमलधिया ययमेव नान्ये ।
तन्त्रेषु यन्त्रमलधियो ययमेव नान्ये
कालेषु सत्यमलधिया ययमेव नान्ये ॥

and B Siddhānta rahasyam

Mathurānātha was a Varknava in his personal creed. His father Śrī Rama Tarkālakara was a great pandit and seems to have been the author of a voluminous Commentary on some work in Nyāyaśāstra*. Probably the commentary was on Chintāmaṇi, and it is interesting to find the son controverting the views of the father. In the Govt Sanskrit Library, Benares, there is a Ms of Śrī Rama's Commentary, called Tīppaṇī, on Raghunātha's Ātmatattvavivekaśikṣā.

IX —BHAVANANDA SIDDHĀNTAVAGIŚA

Bhavananda was one of the ablest representatives of the Nndia School of Thought, and though his works have not enjoyed the same celebrity in Bengal as they have done in the South it does not detract in the slightest degree from their merit. It is a strange fact of which no true historical explanation can yet be rendered that among the commentaries on Bhavananda none has proceeded from Bengal. It seems that soon after its publication the book was subjected to a severe criticism in certain quarters†, and that in conse-

* Evidently the verse is śloka here and has to be interpreted in a double sense, being at once applicable to the great Rāma Chandra and Śrī Rama, Mathura nātha's father. As explained in reference to the second interpretation, the word न्यायानुधि ought to mean a book prepared by Śrī Rama अखिलसम्पत्ति some jagir secured and निमुवन the names of three contemporary scholars named 'Bhuvana vanquished in debate, by whom his glories were sung. I donot know whether all this is not to be rejected as mere conjecture. End of Mathura's Commentary on Tattva chintāmaṇi.

† Oppert (1025, 5278, II, 3408) mentions a treatise of this kind by one Vajratanka Sastrin. But it is a comparatively recent production. Vajratanka seems to have written also a commentary

quence of this the study of the work was left altogether uncared for in the country of its birth*. Thanks are due, however, to Mahādeva Puntamkar for reviving an interest in the study of this valuable but much neglected work and for popularising it through his commentaries.

Bhavānanda left behind him two worthy pupils in Jagadīśa and Rāghavendra†, both of whom distinguished themselves as scholars and made valuable contributions to philosophy and literature.

The name of Bhavānanda's guru is not known. Tradition makes Bhavānanda Mathurānātha's disciple, which on chronological grounds is admissible, but may it not be that he was Raghunātha's direct pupil? The following extract taken from his commentary on Anumanadidhiti, where Raghunātha is referred to as 'Bhagvāchārya', would seem to point to this conclusion.

नीलविशिष्टभूमेऽपि विरोध्यत्वस्योपाधेः सत्त्वेन निरुपाधित्व
साधनव्यापकत्वादिति विरोध्यत्वपाटस्याग्रामाधिकृत्यात् तदुपेक्षितं

on Bhavānandi, called Bhavānandi orakavī (vide Hultsch, No 1462, II, pp 137 S)

* Cf. Mahādeva's pungent remarks towards the beginning of his commentary on Bhavānandi (Anumana) अनागेऽप्य मिद्वान्त-
वार्ताश्रावणं दृष्ट्वा स्फुटितः (?) पण्डितैर्गोप्यते । ददुर्भाषितं दृष्ट्वाभामन्द
तदुद्भाषाधौ समोद्यते ॥

† Rāghavendra was much loved by his tutor. So says Chira-jīva in the Vidyānmodatarajīva

अधीयान्मुदिष्य पाप्यापरेऽयं भवानन्दमिद्वान्तश्रीनि उच्ये ।

अयं नेऽपि देवेन्द्रस्य निविष्टात्कृतव्यासमयां विभर्ति ॥

Chapter I, verse 17

महाचार्यशिरोमणिभिरिति । I hold, therefore, pending further evidence to the contrary, that Bhavānanda was Raghunātha's junior pupil and that on the latter's death or probably on his retirement through the infirmities of age, when teaching was impossible, Bhavānanda completed his studies with Mathurānātha. And this would be in keeping with Bhavānanda's own statement in his commentary on the *Didhiti*:

नमस्कृत्य गुरुन् सर्वान् निगूढं मणिदीधिति ।

श्रीभवानन्दसिद्धान्तवागीशेन प्रकाश्यते ॥

Here is a list of works written by Bhavānanda

A. Commentaries on

(a) Gaṅgeśa's

1. *Tattvachintāmapī*

(b) Pakṣadhara's

1. *Tattvachintāmapyāloka* (= आलोकसारमञ्जरी)

(c) Raghunātha's

1. *Tattvachintāmapīdidhiti* (= दीधितिगूढार्थ
प्रकाशिका)

B

(a) शब्दार्थसारमञ्जरी

(b) कारकचक्र

(c) दशलकारसारमञ्जरी

X—GUNANANDA VIDYĀVĀGĪŚA BHATTĀCHĀRYA

Guṇananda, better known as Vidyāvāgīśa Bhaṭṭāchārya, was a pupil of Madhusūdana and wrote a large number of commentaries, viz on

(a) Udayana's

1. *Nyāyakusumāñjaliprakaraṇa* (= न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलि-
विवेक)* The work is called *तात्पर्यविवेक* in the
Ms of the Govt Sanskrit Library, Benares

* This is a commentary on the whole of *Kusumāñjali*, and not on the metrical portion of it only, as noted by Mr. Chakravarti (J. A. S. B., 1915, p. 279)

(b) Vardhamana's

1. *Guṇa Kīraṇavalīprakāśa* (= गुणविद्युतिविवेक or तात्पर्यसन्दर्भ)

(c) Pakṣadhara's

1. *Tattvachintamanyaloka*, Śabda section (= शब्दालोक-विवेक), and

(d) Raghunatha's

1. *Anumāna Dīdhiti* (= विवेक)
- ii. *Nyāyāhīratīprakāśadīdhiti* (= विवेक)
- iii. *Ātmatattvavivekadīdhiti* (= विवेक)

and iv. *Guṇakīraṇavalīprakāśadīdhiti*. This work is identical with (b) 1.

His time is unknown, but it may be surmised that he lived about the end of the 16th century. This is proved by the fact that there exists in the India Office Library a Ms. of his *Guṇavivrtiviveka* with 1534 Śaka (वेदवाङ्मनियुते शकाब्दे) or 1612 A. D. * as the date of its transcription. Besides, as his tutor cannot be identical with the famous author of the *Advaitasiddhi* the time here proposed for him would not seem incompatible. The fact that he was criticised by the Jain Logician Yaśovijayagani in the latter's *Nyāya Khṛḍḍana Khṛḍḍya* presents no chronological difficulty.

VI — RĀMA RUDRA TARKAĀGIŚA

Rudra to be distinguished from another and more famous Rudra surnamed *Nyāya Vachaspati*† was grandson

* Not 1622 A. D. as stated by Dr. Vidyābhāṣana in his *Indian Logic* p. 468.

† 1608—1688 A. D.

‡ Aufrecht (*Cat. Cat.*, Vol. I, pp. 528—529) has erroneously placed the works of the two Rudras under the single name of Rudra *Nyāya Vachaspati* and made him the grandson of Bhavananda. In Vol. III, p. 112 however the name of Rudra *Nyāyavachaspati*, grandfather appears correctly as *Vidyāvachaspati*.

of Bhavananda Siddhānta-igīṣa on whose Kīrakachakra he wrote a Commentary. In the Colophon he distinctly attributes this work to his grandfather (पितामह)

Rudra wrote another Commentary on the Siddhānta muktāvalī, where he calls his father (ततः) Śrī Rāma (श्री रामधीरेश). Madhusadana may have been the name of his Guru Ind Off, p 674

XII — RĀMABHADRA SĀRVABHAUMA

Very little is known about Ramabhadra's parentage or personal history except that he was the guru of the famous Jagadīśa Tarkalankara*. In the introduction to many of his commentaries (e g on the Padārthātattvanirūpana) he calls himself the son of one Chūdamani whom Hall identifies with the Tarkīlachūdamani Raghunātha†

He was the author of—

A. Commentaries on

(a) Gotama :

- 1 Nyāya Sūtras This commentary is of the nature of a gloss and is generally known by the name न्यायसूत्रस्यम्. Copies of this work are very rare. I examined a complete Ms of the with Pandit Mukunda Śāstrī of Benares, which has since been acquired for the Sanskrit College Library Benares

* Cf Jagadīśa in Śābdasaktiprakāśika — इति पुनर्न्यायस्ये
स्मद्गुरुवरणा, ।

† Mr Chakravartī (J A S B, 1915, p 281) and Dr Vidyābhāṣa (Ind Logic, p 468) wrongly make Ramabhadra the son of Bhavanatha and Bhvānī. The error is apparently due to an original confusion on the part of Aufrecht (Cat Cat, I, p 517) and Stein (p 148)

(b) Udayana's

- i Kusumāñjali Krikas* This was once a very popular commentary and shared the reputation of Haridasa's work in Bengal

ii Guna Kiraṇavali (गुणरहस्यम्)

(c) Raghunātha's

- i Padarthatattvavivechana ('प्रकाश') In this work Rāmabhadra refers to the views of his father (p 112) and of his grandfather (p 111)

* It may be observed that Rāmabhadra was not the author of the entire commentary which in Bengal passes under his name. The earlier part of the work, where the author names his parents as Bhavanātha and Bhavan and where he remarks that in interpreting the text he has closely followed the instructions received from his father ('ततोऽधिकं पिबुव्याख्यामाख्यातुमयमुद्यमः'), is strongly reminiscent of Śaṅkara Miśra and must have proceeded from his pen. And as a matter of fact, for this very reason, the whole commentary is ascribed to Śaṅkara Miśra in Mithilā. To me, however, it seems that the commentary known as Āmoda in Mithilā (noticed by Aufrecht in Oxf Cat p 243 and by Dr Jha in his preface to V diviṃmoda) and as Rāmabhadra in Bengal (noticed in Mitra, No 525) was not the work of a single author but the joint production of Śaṅkara and Rāmabhadra. It had been commenced by Śaṅkara Miśra but for some reason or other left incomplete by him and was subsequently completed by Rāmabhadra Sarvaśhauma. This will explain the origin of the erroneous statement in regard to the parentage of Rāmabhadra. That this is not a mere supposition will be clear from an actual entry in the following extract from the commentary इत्यन्तं शङ्करमिश्रकृतं तत् सार्वभौमायम् (Fol 6a 25 of a very old Ms, in possession of Pandit Harihar Śāstri of Benares). But the full text of Śaṅkara Miśra's 'Āmoda' is also available, a copy of which exists in the Sanskrit College Library Benares. See ante (Vol III,

and B (a) सिद्धान्तरहस्यम् This work is little known but it is referred to in (c) 1 (Reprint from the Pandit p. 96) and therefore preceded it.

(b) सिद्धान्तसार (Burnell, p 121 a).

and (c) सुवर्णतेजसत्ववाद (Hultzsch, No 1404, II. p 133) In this work Rāmabhadra refers the current notion of the logicians regarding the igneous character of gold

XIII.—JAGADĪŚA TARKĀLANKĀRA

Among the disciples of Bhavānanda none was so eminent as the famous Jagadīśa who, with Mathurānātha and Gadādhara, forms the small band of post Didhitiian Logicians in Bengal Jagadīśa is said to have been a descendant of Sanātana Miśra, the father-in-law of Chaitanya Deva and lived probably in the second quarter of the seventeenth century *

From Jagadīśa's statement in the Nyāyarahasya it appears that he was also the pupil of Rāmabhadra Śīrvabhauma

He was the third son of Yadava chandra Vidyāvāgīśa and had five brothers He had two sons, i e Raghunātha, the

p 147) The late Mahamahopadhyaya Mahesa Chandra Nyayaratna (in his 'Brief Notes on the Modern Nyaya System of Philosophy and its technical terms', p 5) ascribed this commentary on the Kusumajjalikārikas to one Rāmabhadra Siddhantavagīśa, whose name is associated by popular tradition with the establishment of the image of Poda-mā at Nadia and whom he takes to be the earliest exponent of Nyaya in Bengal (earlier than Vasudeva Śīrvabhauma) But this is evidently without any foundation in fact

*A Ms of Jagadīśa's Kāvya prakāśa rahasya was copied by one of his pupils in Śaka 1599 (= 1677 A D)

author of *Sāṅkhyatattvavilāsa*, and *Rudreśvara*, the father of *Rāmabhadra Siddhāntavāgīśa*

Jagadīśa was the author of

A Commentaries on

(a) *Prasastapāda*'s

1 *Padārtha Dharma Saṅgraha* (= सूक्ति) This extends to *Dravya* section only

(b) *Gauḍeśa*'s

1 *Tattvachintamanī*

(c) *Raghunātha*'s

1 *Nyāyādhāvatīdīpī*

2 *Tattvachintamanīdīpī* (= प्रकाशिका)

This is popularly known as *Jāgadīśi*

B)a) शुद्धशक्ति प्रकाशिका

(b) तर्कामृत

XIV—RĀGHAVENDRA BHATṬĀCHĀRYA ŚATĀVADHĀNA

Next to *Jagadīśa* the most remarkable person among *Bhavananda*'s disciples was *Rāghavendra Bhaṭṭāchārya*. In the first chapter of *Vidyānmodatarangīnī*, a work of unique interest by *Chirañjīva Bhaṭṭāchārya*, the author, who calls himself *Rāghava*'s son, gives a short but interesting account of his own family. He claims descent from a native of *Rādhapur*, who is said to have been a high authority on ceremonies relating to sacrifice and it is related that once by virtue of his extraordinary powers of sacrifice he was able to ensure the safety of the county of *Gauḍa* from what is naively described as the inroads of *rākṣasas*. He belonged to *Kāśyapa* gotra and his descendants ranked in *Gauḍa* as the noblest in social scale. His descendant in the 5th remove

was Kāśinātha Sīmudrikāchārya, a great polymist, physiognomist and fortune teller*. He had three sons, Rājendra, Rāghavendra and Mahēga

Rāghavendra was certainly the most accomplished of the three brothers. He obtained the title of Bhaṭṭāchārya Śatāvadhāna while he was yet a boy of only 16 years of age. He read various Śāstras in the school of Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgiśa, and became in course of time a past master in the Science of Dialectics and a great controversialist. Rāghavendra was a poet of extraordinary powers, and his Ślokaśatī will ever remain a monument of his marvellous skill in this art. Chiranjīva quotes the following tributary verses written by two different poets in praise of Rāghavendra's wonderful gifts.

One poet says —

(1) अहं हरिहरः सिद्धे रविलम्ब सरस्वती ।

साक्षाच्छ्रुतावधानस्त्वमद्यतीर्णा सरस्वती ॥

The other says

(2) पुरुषादरणी साक्षाद्वतीर्णा सरस्वती ।

जितः शतावधानतो विष्णुनापि न जिष्णुता ॥

All this goes to shew that Rāghavendra was held in great esteem by his contemporaries. Bhavananda was struck with his genius.

अधीयानमुद्दिश्य चाभ्यापकोऽयं भवानन्दसिद्धान्तधामीश ऊचे ।

अयं कोऽपि देवोऽनवद्यातिविद्याचमत्कारधारामपरां विभर्ति ॥

Rāghavendra is credited with three works,—none however on Nyāya,—by his son, viz. श्लोकशती, मन्त्रार्थदीप and रामप्रकाश

XV — RAMABHADRA SIDDHĀNTAVĀGIŚA

Rāmabhadra Siddhāntavāgiśa, a resident of Navadvīpa, is said to have been the son of Rudreśvara and grandson of

* मामुद्रिकेशोऽयं समुद्रकल्प. सामुद्रिकाचार्य इति प्रसिद्धिम् ।

तेभ्यो ज्ञानामाकृतिसंज्ञेन पठ्यते च दन्तमविषयदादि ॥

Jagadīśa.¹ He was the pupil of his grandfather. Cf. the verse 2 at the beginning of his commentary, called प्रयोधिनी (Mitra 3367 or सुयोधिनी), the only work passing under his name on Jagadīśa's Śabdasaktiprakāśikā²

गुरुमिव गुरुमिह नत्वा तत्कृतशब्दशक्तिप्रकाशिकायाम् ।

धोरामभद्रसुकृती कुरते टीकां मुदे सुधियः ॥

Skt. Coll. Catl. p. 265, No 460

XVI.—GAURIKĀNTA SĀRVABHĀUMA BHATTACHĀRYA

Among the Commentators of Tarkabhāṣā Gaurikānta's name occupies perhaps a unique position, both on account of the exhaustive treatment of the topics raised in the text as well as for its great bulk. His Commentary on Tarkabhāṣā is certainly his best production, and perhaps the most thorough work of its kind existing in the literature³

As to his time it may be roughly fixed in this way

In the work just mentioned Gaurikānta alludes very frequently to the views of Balabhadra and Govardhana and vehemently denounces them as erroneous† Govardhana's age has been ascertained to be the 16th century, which therefore furnishes the upper limit of Gaurikānta's life period.

* This Commentary is wrongly ascribed to Ramabhadra Sārvabhauma in the Preface (p. 2) to Padārthatattvanirūpana (V P. Dube's Edition)

† See, for instance, the following extract from the Bhavarthodipikā where the definition of वाग्वि by Balabhadra and Govardhana has been attacked by Gaurikānta यत् अनुभवन्व्याप्यज्ञा-
त्यप्यज्ञात्पर्यवर्तनानि कर्तव्याणां चाप्यस्य सति व्यापारस्य सति प्रमादस्य इति
मोक्षं नोक्तं, यद्यप्यप्यज्ञानस्य सति व्यापारस्य सति अनुभवन्व्या-
प्यज्ञात्यप्यज्ञात्पर्यवर्तनानि कर्तव्याणि सन्ति प्रमादस्य इति तदेव दर्शनं
परित्यज्य यत्प्रमादस्य तदनुभवमप्यनुक्तम् ।

the other or lower limit, however, is afforded by the age of Mādhava Deva (i. e. the end of 17th century) who quotes and criticises the opinion of Gaurikānta in his own तर्कभाषासारमञ्जरी । Hence it may be concluded with tolerable certainty that Gaurikānta lived in the early part of the 17th century.

Gaurikānta's works are :

A Commentaries on

- (a) Praśastapāda's Padārthadharma Saṁgraha.
This work, unknown to Aufrecht, I find mentioned under the title of वैशेषिकभाष्य-
विवरण in his Bbāvarthadīpikā (Benares
College Ms. 156, fol. 3b).

(b) Keśava Miśra's

- i. Tarkabhāṣā (=भाषार्थदीपिका). This work is also
called विवरण in the colophon of the chapter of the
Benares College Ms. 156, fol. 25b.

Commenting on the nature of anubhava in his Commen-
tary on the Tarkabhāṣā Gaurikānta quotes the following
verse and says that it occurs in the text in some Mss :

संचिदु मगवती देवी स्मृत्यनुभववेदिका ।
अनुभूतिः स्मृतेरन्या स्मृतिः संस्कारमात्रजा ॥

Fol. 9b.

(c) Raghunātha's

- i. Tattva Chintāmaṇḍīdhiti.

This work, too, is not mentioned in Aufrecht, but is
referred to as मणिदीधिति विवेचन (Ms 156, fol. 22b)
in connection with the discussion of प्रत्यासत्ति.

(d) Annam Bhaṭṭa's

- i. Tarkasaṅgraha

B

(a) सद्युक्तिमुक्तावली

Gaurikānta's reference to Sarvabhauma (Benares College Ms 163, fol 138b) in conjunction with Didhātāra must be understood as standing for the great Vasudeva Sarvabhauma, and not for Rāma bhadra or Kṛṣṇadāsa. It is not yet known whether Gaurikānta was a poet, but he describes himself as कवितार्किकचक्रवर्ती in the colophon of the Pratyakṣa section of his Bhāvartha dīpikā (Benares College Ms 156)

XVII — HARIRĀMA TARKAVĀGĪṢA * (1625 A D)

Harirāma's reputation as an eminent Naiyāyika of the Nadia school does not rest so much upon his own productions, as upon his relation as tutor to the great Gadādhara Bhaṭṭācārya. But there is no doubt that he was the recognised head of the then Naiyāyika community of Navadvīpa. It is said that he used to get the highest reward in all public assemblies, a distinction which has invariably been confined to the scholar occupying the foremost rank at Nadia for erudition and controversial eloquence. Of the long list of his works the greater part are already forgotten, except one or two little pieces which are sometimes used by inquisitive students. His works were numerous and strikingly original. Here are some names

A Commentaries on

(a) Śivādītya's

1. Saptapadārthi

* Also surnamed Tarkālakṣa.

(b) Gaṅgeśa's

1. Tattva Chintāmaṇi. The author of 'Navadvīpa Mahimā' describes it as a mere adaptation from Chintāmaṇi, and not an actual commentary

B A large number of brief tracts, e.g.

- (a) आचार्यमत रहस्य, vindicating Udayana's theory of anumiti viz,—

"बहिर्व्याप्यधूमवान् पर्वत इत्यादिपरामर्शात् बहिर्व्याप्तिविशिष्टधूमादिविषयिनी बहिर्व्याप्यधूमवान् पर्वतो बहिर्मानित्यनुमितिरुत्पद्यते ।"

(b) न्यायनव्यमतविचार

(c) रत्नकोशविचार

(d) विषयतावाद

(e) प्रत्यासत्तिविचार

- (f—k) मङ्गलवाद, प्रमाणप्रमोद, अनुमितिपरामर्शबाधबुद्धि, प्रतिबन्धकताविचार, विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्यबोधविचार, नव्यधर्मितावच्छेदकता ।

Harirāma died a ripe old man Gadādhara* and Raghudeva† were his principal students

Harirāma quotes among other works, from one Nyāya Kaustubha. But it is evident that this can not have been the work of the famous Mahādeva Punatamkar who was his successor. In the Govt Sanskrit Library Benares, there is a Ms of Raghudeva's Commentary on the Kusumāñjali Karikas transcribed by Mahādeva in his own hand. As Raghudeva was Harirāma's pupil Mahādeva could not have lived before the latter.

* Hall, p 55

† Weber, I p 204 (Ms 685, Dravyasarasaugraha of Raghudeva) Peterson, VI pp 15-16

As a teacher of Raghudeva Harirāma may be assigned to the first quarter of the 17th century.

XVIII.—JAYARAMA NYĀYAPAÑCHANANA

From the introductory verse (No 1) of his commentary on the Dīditi it appears that Jayarāma was the pupil of one Rāmahadra Bhaṭṭācharya *. But who this Rāmahadra might have been there is no means of ascertaining. Mr Chakravarti takes him as the author of Nyāyabhasyam which is likely, but it seems to me more probable that he was the same as the pupil of Jagadīśa Jayarāma's time can be determined with exactness and he may be assigned to the third and fourth quarters of the 17th century. For there is evidence to show that he was living at Benares in Samvat 1714 or 1657 A D † and composed one of his works in Sam 1750 or 1693 A D.

He is known to have been the author of the following works

A. Commentaries on

(a) Gautama's

- 1 Nyāya Sūtras (न्यायसिद्धान्तमाला) The work contains the following references—

पदार्थमाला, 3b², 6c² 4a²; प्रमेयतत्त्वयोधकृतः, 1a¹; प्रमेय-
तत्त्वयोध, 1b¹, 11b¹ 2, तत्त्वयोधे वर्धमानः, 5c¹, वर्धमानः, 9b¹,
10a¹, 10b¹, वर्धमानादयः, 1c¹. नन्याः, 41a¹, 10b², 13a², 13b²
116b¹; प्रशस्तपादभाष्य, 4b¹, भाष्यकृतः, 13a¹, यासिककृतः, 6b¹;

* मूलन्यायस्य च राममन्त्रचरणद्वन्द्वारविन्दद्वयम् । Line 3

† In the 'Decision' of Benares Pandits dated Sam 1714 the name of Pt Jayarāma Nyāyapañchanana occurs in the list of the signatories. This 'Decision' has been published by R S Pimpalkar in his 'विश्वमदप्रकरण' (1926), pp 72-81

वार्त्तिकद्वयः, 8a²; वार्त्तिककारः, 18b³; न्यायनिबन्धप्रकाशः, 12b⁴;
टीकाकृतः, 14b⁵; उपाध्यायाः, 20a⁶, 29b⁷; मणिकृतः, 28a⁸;
मणिकृतद्वययानिनः, 75a⁹; मिथ्याः, 29b⁷; दीधितिकृतः, 32a¹⁰;
75a⁹; आचार्याः, 34b⁶, रत्नकोपकृतः, 83b¹¹; वागीशः, 96b³ (the
view is refuted by the author); प्राञ्चः, 116b¹; मणिकण्ठ,
135b⁴, 135a⁶; श्वरस्वामिनः, 145a¹.

It was composed in Sam 1750 or 1693 A. D.*

(b) Udayana's

- i. Kusumāñjali Kārikās (चिबृति). It is referred
to in his Padārthamālā. †

(c) Pakṣadharma's

- I. Tattvachintāmanyāloka (चिबेक) Referred
to as Alokarahasya in his commentary on the
Kusumāñjali kārikās.

(d) Raghunātha's

1. Guṇa Kiraṇāvalīprakāśa dīdhiti
11. Tattvachintāmanī dīdhiti (= गूढार्थचिद्योत or
दीधितिचिबृति).

B.

- (a) पदार्थमाला or पदार्थमणिमाला or शब्दार्थमाला ‡.
It is a valuable treatise, quite original in its
treatment. The author declares his object in
writing this tract as purely critical :

* Vidyābhūṣaṇa. Indian Logic, p 478.

† अधिष्ठं कारिकाव्याख्यायामनुसन्धेयम् (fol 74b⁴ of Ms 168
belonging to Govt. Sanskrit Library, Benares). Three Mss of this
work exist in the Govt. Sanskrit Library, Benares

‡ Śabdārthamālā is not a distinct work, as Mr. Chakravartī
(J. A. S. B., 1915, p. 283) and Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa (Ind.

भाष्याद्युक्तिषु हीनयुक्तियु रतिः प्रेक्षावतां प्रेक्ष्यते
 छायायै विहितापि सुकिरहिता वाणी कचिद्वक्ष्यते ।
 मत्वेव जयराम एव विपुले सद्युक्तिमुक्ताफलैः
 प्रव्यक्तं चितनेति कोविदमुदे शन्दार्पमालामिमाम् ॥

From the above it appears that the work was intended to form a kind of supplement to the *Prāṣastapāda bhāṣyam* and the *Kṛāṇāvali*

- (b) अन्यथाप्यातिविचार
- (c) लघुसन्निकर्षवाद
- (d) न्यायमाला

XIX.—GADĀDHARA BHATTĀCHARYA (1650 A D)

Gadādhara, son of Jivacharya and a younger contemporary of Jugadisa, was a Varendra Brahman, originally of Lakṣmīchāpar in the district of Pabna*. He came to Nadia for prosecution of studies, and being admitted to the *śol* of Harirāma Tarkavagīśa, the greatest living professor of Nyāyaśāstra, he was soon able through diligence and steady application to win for himself the favour of his tutor and rise into prominence. It is said that owing to Harirāma's death before completion of his studies Gadādhara could not secure any title of distinction

Logic, p 478) hold but only another name of the Padārthamālā. The author himself employs the two names indifferently for this work. Thus in the second benedictory verse at the beginning (पदार्थमाला वारता &c) and in the second verse at the end of the Dravya section (पदार्थमाला यदि नाम वाला &c) the name Padārthamālā is used, but in verse 1 at the end of the Dravya section the work is referred to under the name of Śābdārthamālā (इत्यनेति रश्मि धर्मालादिमाम्)

* Navadvīpamahimā p 82. In the copy of the India Office Ms. of Gadādhara's Anumanādiśāstrapaddhati, he is called मद्रागदो-
 पद्वाय तीक्ष्णरीय मद्रागदो (Ind Off Cat. p 607).

It was Harirāma's dying wish that on his death Gadādhara should succeed him to professorship in his *śol*, as otherwise its reputation would not be maintained. Gadādhara readily consented to comply with this last wish of his tutor, and began to teach, but he soon found to his great disappointment that no students cared to come up to him for study, and even the old batch deserted him one by one. His absence of a "conventional title" of merit was a bar to his real claim to tutorship. However, Gadādhara was not a man to allow his spirits to be damped by this. He left his tutor's place, and founded a school of his own in a delightful little garden on the wayside of the mainroad leading to the Ganges. Here in the cooling shades of the trees he made his abode. In the absence of any students coming to hear him he would deliver his lectures before the creepers and plants of flowers. Pandits coming to the garden for plucking flowers and passing by it on their way to the Ganges for bathing would often pause to hear him and found his discourses as learned as attractive. Gadādhara's fame thus spread around within a remarkably short period and drew towards him flocks of students from various quarters*.

He was the author of—

A Commentaries on

(a) Udayana's

i Nyāyakusumāñjali

(b) Pakṣadhara's

i Tattvachintāmanjāloka

(c) Raghunātha's

i Atmatattvaviveka dīdhiti Tradition places this among the earliest works of Gadādhara

ii Tattvachintāmanidīdhiti

B.

(a) ब्रह्मनिर्णय

and (b) 64 short treatises, known as Vādārthas, dealing each with a separate topic of the new school of Nyaya Philosophy, such as: i विषयतावाद, ii शक्तिवाद, iii मुक्तिवाद, iv व्युत्पत्तिवाद, v सादृश्यवाद, vi रत्न कोशवाद, vii कारणतावाद, viii अनुमितिमानसवाद, ix नव्यमतवाद, x विधिस्वरूपवाद, &c &c.

Gadādhara was a Vaiṣṇava, being a votary of the Vṛndāvana form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa (नन्दतनूज), but he did not fail to pay due reverence to the other forms of the Divinity. Cf his benediction in the Chintāmanidīdhitī (Anumāna) where he invokes the blessings of Durgā (गिरीन्द्र हृदिता).

His principal student was Jayarāma Tarkāṇkār (S V)

XX.—RAGHUDEVA NYĀYALĀṆKĀRA (1650 A.D)

Raghudeva was also Harirāma's disciple, and plain^{ly} refers to him as his guru in Dravyasarasangraha (Weber I, p 204)*. He is said to have been Bhavānanda's descendant. He wrote the following works

* In Nāṇada (Oxf, p 245, Ms 617) he names his guru Tarkavagīśvara which must be understood, in conjunction with the above statement as applying definitely to Harirāma

Bodas in his Introduction to Tarkasāṅgraha, p 45 and Pt V, P Dube in the preface of his edition of Padārthatattvanirupāṇa p 2, wrongly make Raghudeva Mathurānātha's disciple. This mistake was evidently occasioned by the fact of both Mathurānātha and Harirāma bearing a common title (viz Tarkavagīśa). But away from the above extract which throws light on the whole question the mistake will also be apparent when it is known that he was Bhavānanda's descendant in the 3rd or 4th

A Commentaries on

(a) Kanāda Sūtras

(b) Udayana's

1 Nyaya Kusuma rajah Karikas*

(c) Gaṅgeśa's

1 Tattva Chintamāni This commentary is known as गूढार्थदीपिका, or popularly by the name of the author as Raghudevi

(d) Raghunatha's

1 Padārtha tattva nirupana

ii Tattva Chintamāni didhiti

iii Akhyāta vada

B (a) विषयताविचार । Raghudeva refers to this in his commentary on Padārthātattvanirūpana (Fandit Ed, p 78)

(b) द्रव्यसारसंग्रह,

(c) निवृत्तिप्रकाश .

and (d) a certain number of tracts, such as (i) विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्य बोधविचार, (ii) अनुमितिपरामर्शविचार, (iii) सामग्रीवाद, (iv) प्रतियोगिज्ञानकारणताविचार &c &c

Raghudeva is sometimes identified with the new Kanāda, but this does not seem to be correct. For we know that Kanāda's guru was one Chhāṇamāni, as mentioned in his own Bhāṣyaratna and not Harirāma or even Jagadīśa (S V Kanāda)

remove (N Mahimā p 80) and that the latter was Mathurānātha's direct pupil. But the verses at the end of the Naṭhīśādi (अग्र सूक्तं दुष्टं वा यन् रिञ्चित्रं जल्पितं मया । तन् मया जगदाशस्य प्रीत्यर्थं मिथ्यनिन्दितम्) seem to show that he read also with Jagadīśa. Or perhaps the word Jagadīśa means God and nothing more.

* There is a Ms of this work dated Samvat 1739 (= 1682 A D) in the Govt Sanskrit Library Benares. It was transcribed by the great Nāyāyika Mahādeva Puntamkar.

On the basis of this supposed identity between Raghudeva & Kanada and of the fact that Śaṅkara Miśra pays obeisance to Kanada in the Upaskara, Bodas makes Śaṅkara pupil of Raghudeva

Raghudeva lived at Benares Mm Haraprasad Śāstri, in his Report on Sanskrit MSS (1906 7—1910 11, p 6), assigns him to the beginning of the 18th Century But this date is certainly wrong In the Govt Sanskrit College Library, Benares, there is a manuscript of Raghudeva's commentary on the *Kusumañjali* *harikās* transcribed by Mahadeva Puntamkar in Sam 1739 or 1682 A D Raghudeva was therefore of an earlier date The 'Decision' of Benares Pandits referred to above contains the signature of Raghudeva This 'Decision' is dated Samvat 1714 (*वृत्तफणाब्दं*) and Śaka 1579 (*नन्दयौलशरमूमितशके*), that is 1657 A, D which is consequently the exact date of Raghudeva

XXI —JAYARĀMA TARKALĀṆKARA (1675 A D)

Jayarāma's father Jayadeva was the court pandit of Putia in the District of Rajshaher, and had been originally a native of Pabna In old age he retired to Navadvipa where he settled permanently Jayarāma is said to have received his education in the *śāl* of Gadadhara and wrote a commentary, the only work by him yet known to us, on his teacher's *Śaktivāda**

His most famous pupil was Viśvanatha Pañchanana, the author of *Bhāṣāpanchcheda* and *Muktavali*†

* Hall, however, assigns it to a pupil of Jayarāma (p 56)

† The line of Viśvanatha's teachers is given thus in the popular saying *इरे मदा, मदा अय । जदा विदु णव कय ॥* which gives us the order —Harirāma Tarkaviṣṭi (i—Gadadhara Bhattacharya—Jayarāma Tarkalāṅkara—Viśvanatha Pañchanana

XXII.—VIŚVANATHA NYĀYASIDDHĀNTA.
PANĀCHANĀNĀ (1654)

Of all the authors of Nyāya tracts whose aim has been to bring the subject within easy reach none has achieved a greater success than Viśvanātha, the eldest son of Vidyā-niwaśa, of Nadia.* His *Bhāṣāparichcheda* with his own gloss upon it named *Nyāya Siddhānta Muktvāli*† occupies even now the foremost position among the manuals on Nyāya Vaiśeṣika philosophy, and for a learned and lucid interpretation of the original sūtras of Gotama no better work is available than his *Nyāyasūtravṛtti*. His other works are less known but equally interesting. As to religious belief he was a Vaiṣṇava and passed the last years of his life in retirement and devotion at Brindavan. It was here that he composed, in 1576 Śaka or 1654 A. D., his learned commentaries on Nyāya Sāṅga in pursuance of Śiromaṇi's interpretation. He belonged to the second and third quarters of the 17th Century, and was the author of the following books:

A Glosses on

(a) Gotama's

1. N. Sūtras (न्यायसूत्रवृत्ति), composed in 1654.

* His younger brothers were Nārāyaṇa and his father was the son of the younger brother of the great Vasudeva Śāryabhauma (p. 119) and is said to have been highly honoured by Raja Mansingh of Amber and defeated in a public assembly at the Court of Todāimall the great scholar Nārāyaṇa Bhāṣya of Benares.

† This work reminds one of a less known but similarly named treatise on Vedānta, viz. *Vedānta Siddhānta Muktvāli* by Prakāśananda Svāmī. Prakāśananda was undoubtedly an earlier author and it was his work which appears to have inspired the title of Viśvanātha's gloss on his own Kārikās.

(b) Raghunātha Śiromapi s

1 Padārtha tattvanirūpanam

(c) His own

1 Bhaṣapariśchhedha a collection of couplets summarising the doctrines of the Vaiśeṣika philosophy. The work purports to have been written for the use of the author's nephew (?) Rajiva. There is a copy of this work belonging to Nṛsiṃha Dikṣita, dated 1719 Sam or 1662 A D

B

(a) न्यायतन्त्रवेधिलो

(b) सुवर्णतत्त्वलोका

XXIII—TRILOCHANADEVA

Trilochana was the pupil of one Rima, a professor of Nadiā and refers to Vachaspati Miśra Śiromapi Bhaṭṭāchārya and Guṇānanda*. His works are

A Commentaries on

(a) Udayana s

1 Kusumanjali (= कुसुमजालन्यासा)

and (b) Viśvanatha s

1 Nyāyasiddhāntamuktāvalī called लोचनी after the author's name (Hultsch, II, p 132 no 1397) †

* See Hall p 84

† Aufrecht notes that the work is based on an earlier commentary on the Muktāvalī by Madhusūdana named Mahāprabhā (Cat. Cat., III p. 89)

Mahadeva Bhaṭṭacharya He was the son of Vāgīś varacārya and Bhagīrathu From evidences of style and the method of interpretation I feel strongly inclined to identify this writer with the author of a similar gloss on the Sākhya Sūtras (Sākhyaavṛttisāra) If this identification be correct Mahadeva had been the pupil of one Svayampṛakaśa Tīrtha who conferred on him the title of 'Vedantin' *

His time falls in the last quarter of the 17th Century At the end of his Commentary on विष्णुसहस्रनाम he gives Samvat 1750 (खवाणमुनिभूमाने) or 1693 A D as the date of its composition

महादेवोऽकरोट् व्याख्या विष्णोर्नामसहस्रनाम् ।

खवाणमुनिभूमाने वत्सरे श्रीमुखाभिधे ॥५॥

Weber, Vol II, p 113

[Cf Garbe's Sākhya Philosophie, p 78 and Sākhya und Yoga (Grundriss Series), p 9]

XXVI — RĀMA CHANDRA SIDDHĀNTAVAGĪŚA

I noticed a Ms of Rāma Chandra's Commentary on the Chintāmaṇidīpikā Pratyakṣa section (प्रत्यक्षमणिदीपिति-विवेचन) in the family Library of Babu Dikṣita Jade of Benares The Ms was incomplete, containing only a few

* See

(i) the Colophon at the end of Berlin MS (636) of his Sākhyaavṛttis in Chap I

इति स्वयंप्रकाशापाठविष्णवेदमन्त्रमयः महादेवनाम्ना साव्यसि सार प्र० अख्याय ।

Weber, p 185

and (ii) the beginning of Berlin MS (1524) of his Commentary on विष्णुसहस्रनाम—

स्वयंप्रकाशापाठविष्णवेदमन्त्रमयः ।

महादेवा र्भवाप्ये विष्णुनामसहस्रनाम् ॥

Weber Vol II p 113

leaves at the end. In the Colophon, which is happily preserved, the author is styled Mahamahopadhyāya

XXVII—ŚRIKRISHNA- NYĀYAVAGIŚA BHATTA- CHĀRYA

Śrī Kṛṣṇa was the son of Govinda Nyāyālabhīra and was the author of a Commentary on the Nyāya Siddhānta mañjarī, called भावदीपिका । This Commentary was written, as the author himself intimates in the Colophon, at the instance of one Rājā Bhāva Simha, son of Śatruśālya * No clue is given as to the identity of these kings†

The author of Navadvīpa Mahimā says (p 88), without stating any authority, that this Govinda was the descendant of the great Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma and that he was the leading pandit at the Court of Nadia. It is also said that he received 1000 *lighas* of rent free land in the village of Aḍahāndī.

* I inspected a complete, and apparently very old, Ms of this work in the family collection of Babu Dikrā Jale of Benares, where on fol 139 the following colophon was found :

इति श्रीगोविन्दन्यायलंकारमहाध्यायं त्रयश्रीरूपान्यायमगोशमहाचार्य विर-
चितायां न्यायसिद्धान्तमञ्जरीटीकायां शब्दव्याख्यानमाप्तः । शयनशयननूतन्य
भाषासिद्धमहोपदे, । भाषाया रचितो ग्रन्थो भावसिद्धिनिरोधः ।

May this Śatruśālya be identical with the hero of the poem, Śatruśālya Charita by one Vivvanatha, son of Narayana, which Peterson notices (3 342) ?

† Ramanāyana was the acknowledged head of the Pandit Community of Nadia towards the end of the 18th Century. Among his other pupils was the famous पुनो रामनाथ or Rāmanātha 'the wild'—a nick name won for his dwelling on the outskirts of the village—whose name has become a familiar expression for plain living and high thinking.

XXIV.—RĀMA KṚṢṆA BHATṬĀCHĀRYA : CHAKRAVARTI.

In introducing his commentary on Rāma Kṛṣṇa's *Tār-kāmṛta* Kṛṣṇa Kānta Vidyāvāgiśa gives a brief but interesting outline of the early history of the author's line. He says that in the village of Kotaliparnh, which as we know even now maintains a position of intellectual eminence in Bengal, there once lived a Brahmin, named Govinda, who was well versed in the *Kalāpa* system of Grammar and in *Smṛti* and used to teach these subjects to his pupils. He had a son, whose name does not appear in the work, and three grandsons viz *Durgāprasāda*, *Chandīdāsa* and *Devīdāsa*. *Devīdāsa* was the youngest and apparently the most intelligent of the group. He had a scholarly disposition. Having finished his education at home, he went out to Nadia, then the centre of Culture in Eastern India, with the idea of prosecuting higher studies in philosophy. He sat for a long time at the feet of the famous logician *Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgiśa* and became one of his most favourite pupils. It is said that even on the first interview *Bhavānanda* had been so much struck with his scholarship that he had predicted about his future greatness. He then married and went to Benares, where he became known for his learning under the title of "*Vidyābhūṣaṇa*". It was here that his son, *Rāmākṛṣṇa* was born. ११८

About *Rāmākṛṣṇa* himself *Kṛṣṇakānta* says little, excepting that he was thoroughly conversant with all the *Śāstras*, was a great pandit and won wide celebrity. Besides this which fact in the course of his marriage *Devīdāsa* came to Pāṭali, and settled * there as teacher till the end of his life.

* *Kṛṣṇakānta* quotes the old popular saying which speaks of 6 (or 7) great contemporary scholars, viz. *Jayadeva* and *Rudranatha* at Nadia, *Ramānātha* at Pūrvasthali, three *Bhūṣaṇas* at Pāṭali and *Rāma-āma* at Tadiṭa.

Whether Rāmakṛṣṇa returned to Bengal and settled at Nadia or stayed on at Benares, is not known. But it is certain that his influence travelled far and wide, and was not confined to provincial limits.

Kṛṣṇakānta, Rāma Kṛṣṇa's great grandson, having lived in 1801 A. D. Rāma Kṛṣṇa's time may be assigned* with some probability to the last quarter of the 17th Century.

He wrote

A. Commentaries on

(a) Rāghuātha Śiromani's

i. Nyāyahlāvati dīdhiti

ii. Tattvachintamani dīdhiti

iii. Guṇa Kiraṇāvali prakāśa dīdhiti.

and B. (a) Nyāyadīpikā

(b) Tarkāṃpta

(c) A certain number of Vādārthas.

XXV.—MAHĀDEVA BHATTĀCHĀRYA.

There exists in the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares, a MS of a work named *मितमापिण्ड* which on examination is found to be a gloss on the Nyāya Sūtras of Gotama, attributed in the Colophon to one

* शास्त्रे रामाक्षिण्डितितिविनिमित्तं (Ind. Off. Cat. p. 654, Ms.

No. 814)

इति महावार्धभूमिद्वयवृत्तौ मितमापिण्डं व्याख्येयं द्वितीयमापिण्डम् ।

Fol 36b

This clear statement of the author-ship should at once dispel the error of Aufrecht (Cat. Cat. I. 437) who ascribes the work, apparently on the similarity of names, to Mahadeva Puṇḍarikar. The title Bhattacharya is a certain indication of the author's Bengali descent. The Nyāya Sūtra Vṛtti is said to have been undertaken at the request of one Somesvara Bhattacharya.

Mahādeva Bhattacharya He was the son of Vāgīśvaracarya and Bhagirathi From evidences of style and the method of interpretation I feel strongly inclined to identify this writer with the author of a similar gloss on the Sākhya Sūtras (Sākhyaavrittisara) If this identification be correct Mahadeva had been the pupil of one Svayampṛakāśa Tīrtha who conferred on him the title of 'Vedantin' *

His time falls in the last quarter of the 17th Century At the end of his Commentary on विष्णुसहस्रनाम he gives Samvat 1750 (खवाणमुनिभूमाने) or 1693 A D as the date of its composition

महादेवोऽकरोद् व्याख्या विष्णोर्नामसहस्रनाम् ।

खवाणमुनिभूमाने वत्सरे श्रीमुखामिधे ॥ २०

Weber, Vol II, p 113

[Cf Garbe's Sākhya Philosophie, p 78 and Sākhya und Yoga (Grundriss Series), p 9]

XXVI — RAMACHANDRA SIDDHANTAVĀGIŚA

I noticed a Ms of Rama Chandra's Commentary on the Chintamanidīdhiti Pratyakṣa section (प्रत्यक्षमणिदीधिति-विवेचन) in the family Library of Babu Dikṣita Jade of Benares The Ms was incomplete containing only a few

* See

(i) the Colophon at the end of Berlin MS (636) of his Sākhyaavrittisara Chap I

इति स्वयंप्रकाशनाथाहप्रितुष्येदान्तिमत्पदं महादेवोऽप्रीते सार्वभौमसि
सार प्र० अध्याय ।

Weber, p 185

and (ii) the beginning of Berlin MS (1524) of his Commentary on Vāṇusahasranāma—

स्वयंप्रकाशनाथाहप्रितुष्येदान्तिमत्पदं ।

महादेवा धर्माच्छे निष्ठासहस्रनाम् ॥

Weber, Vol II p 113

leaves at the end. In the Colophon, which is happily preserved, the author is styled Mahāmahopādhyāya

XXVII—ŚRIKRISHNA. NYAYAVAGISA BHATTA CHĀRYA

Śrī Kṛṣṇa was the son of Govinda Nyāyālaṅkāra and was the author of a Commentary on the Nyaya Siddhānta māñjarī, called भावदीपिका । This Commentary was written, as the author himself intimates in the Colophon, at the instance of one Rāja Bhāva Simha, son of Śatruṣālya * No clue is given as to the identity of these kings†

The author of Navadvīpa Mahimā says (p 88), without stating any authority, that this Govinda was the descendant of the great Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma and that he was the leading pandit at the Court of Nadia. It is also said that he received 1000 *light*s of rent free land in the village of Aḍahāndi

* I inspected a complete, and apparently very old, Ms of this work in the family collection of Bābu Dikṛta Jale of Benares, where on fol 139 the following colophon was found
इति श्रीगोविन्दन्यायार्हकारभट्टाचार्यसंनिधौ न्यायसिद्धान्तमञ्जर्याय वि-
चितायां न्यायसिद्धान्तमञ्जर्यटीकायां शब्दशङ्क समाप्तः । शत्रुशत्यनन्तरं
भार्यसिद्धिर्हासने ॥ आश्रया रचितो ग्रन्थो भार्यसिद्धिर्निरीक्षणः ।

May this Śatruṣālya be identical with the hero of the poem, Śatruṣālya Chārita by one Visvanātha, son of Narayana which Peterson notices (3 342) ?

† Raman rājana was the acknowledged head of the Pandit Community of Nadia towards the end of the 18th Century. Among his other pupils was the famous गुनो रामनाथ or Rāmanātha the wild—a nick name won for his dwelling on the outskirts of the village—whose name has become a familiar expression for plain living and high thinking

XXVIII — KRṢṢA KĀNTA VIDYĀVĀGIŚA

Kṛṣṣa Kanta, the son of Kalīcharana Nyāyālaṅkāra and Tārini Devī and a pupil of Rāmanārāyaṇa Tarkapañchānaṅga was a Brahmin of the Vaidic class. He flourished towards the end of 18th and beginning of 19th Century—during the reign of Maharajā Girisachandra of Krishnagara.*

He was the author of

A Commentaries on

(a) Raghunātha's

1 Padārthatattvanirūpana

(b) Jagadīśa's

1 Śabda śakti prakāśikā (शक्तिसन्दीपनी)

This work was composed in Śaka 1723 or 1801 A. D.

(c) Ramakṛṣṣa's

1 Tarkāmṛta

B (a) Nyayaratnavali

VII

AN

INDEX TO THE PROPER NAMES

OCCURRING IN

VĀLMĪKI'S RĀMĀYANA

(Based on Bombay and Calcutta Editions)

By

MANMATHA NATHA RAY, M. A.

PREFATORY NOTE

It is hardly possible to overestimate the value of scientific indexing, especially of works which are considered as forming the basic literature for the cultural study of a nation. From this point of view the Epics and the Purāṇas occupy the foremost position. Much has been done of late in this direction—though more still remains—for the Mahābhārata by such eminent scholars as Hopkins and Sørensen, but the Rāmāyana seems to have received but scant attention. The labours of Weber, Jacobi and others in connection with the Rāmāyana, like those of Holtzmann, Dahlmann, etc. for the sister Epic, are indeed laudable, but they cannot render a thorough indexing (descriptive, nominal and topical) of these works unnecessary.

So far as Nominal Index is concerned Sørensen's work on the Mahābhārata may be taken to be a model. A similar work on the Rāmāyana has long been felt to be a desideratum. Mr. Manmatha nātha Roy, M. A., a Research Scholar of the Govt. Sanskrit College Benares, whom I entrusted with the compilation of an Index of this kind, has just finished his work, and I am glad to introduce it to the public. In the present work the writer has given a descriptive account of all the proper names that occur in the Epic, and in the "Topical Index", which is to follow as a separate work very soon, an attempt has been made to sum up under specific heads the entire contents of the Text. It is expected that this will greatly facilitate a closer study of the Rāmāyana.

The numerical references in the Index are to the Bangavasi Edition of the Text of 1308 B. S., corresponding to the Nirṇaya Sagar Edition of 1921.

Government Sanskrit College }
Benares

OOPINATH KAVIRAJ

INDEX TO RĀMAYANA

A

AMŚUDHANA—a village Finding it difficult to cross the Gangā here Bharata drove to Prāg-vaṭa (II 71 9)

AMŚUMAN—Son of Asamañja (I 38 22, 1 70 38) Agreeable to all people and of sweet speech (I 38 23) दृढधन्वा महारथः (I 39 6) Placed in charge of the sacrificial horse by Sagara (I 39 6 7) At the desire of Sagara went to the nether world in search of his uncles and the cattle-lifter, directed by the Regional Elephants Coming upon the heap where his uncles had been reduced to ashes, he found the horse roaming about With the advice of Garuḍa performed the Tarpana ceremony in memory of his uncles with the water of the Gangā, and then returned to Sagara with the horse to complete the sacrifice (I 41 1 23) पुढपव्याघ्रः (I 41 14) महातेजाः (I 41 15) शूरः कृतचिन्तः तेजसा पूर्वं तुल्य (I 41 2) Elected king by the people on the demise of Sagara A great king, whose son was Dilipa Passing on the reins of the government to Dilipa, practised austerities on the heights of the Himavan for 32 lakh years (I 42 1 4) चौर्यवान्, महातपाः (I 41 22) सुधार्मिकः (I 42 1) तपोधनः (I 42 4) तेजसा लोके अग्रतिमः (I 44 9) राजर्षिः गुणवान् महर्षिसमतेजाः, ब्रह्मदुल्लस्यतपाः, क्षत्रधर्मस्थित (I 44 10)

AHAMPANA—Carried the news of the destruction of the Rakṣasa colony of Janasthāna to Rāvana at Laṅka (III 31 1 2) In reply to Ravana's enquiries as to who did it (III 31 3 7), described with his leave the appearance (III 31 10 11), strength and valour of Rama (III 31 14 20, 22 28) and finally advised Ravana to abduct Sita without whom he thought Rama could not live long (III 31 29 31) Appointed general of the Rakṣasa army by Rāvana after Vajra daṁṣṭra सर्वशास्त्रकोविदः A strict disciplinarian, defender and leader of the army in wars, well wisher of Rāvana and

an experienced soldier (IV. 55 1-4) मेघाभः मेघवर्णः मेघ-
स्वनमहास्वनः (VI. 55. 7). In the battle field never shook
even before the Devas (VI 55 8) सिंहोपचितस्कन्धः शार्दूल-
समविक्रमः (VI 55 12). Went out at the head of a large
army driving in a chariot and disregarding all sorts of omens
(VI. 55 7-13). Did fearful slaughter in the ranks of the
Vānara army (VI. 55. 28). Finding that the Rākṣasa
army was being cornered by the Vanaras, drove the chariot
that side and wrought havoc in the ranks of the Vanaras
(VI. 56 1 7). रथिनां वरः (VI 56 6). Received Hanu-
mān with a shower of arrows (VI. 56. 11). Cut off the
hill-top to pieces with which Hanuman attacked him (VI.
56. 18). On finding the havoc wrought by Hanumān in the
ranks of the Rākṣasa army (VI. 56. 19-24), shot 14 deadly
arrows at him and fought on till struck down dead (VI.
56. 25-30). महात्मा नवोदिताकौपमनाघ्रवक्त्रः. Accompanied
Rāvaṇa to the battle-field riding on an elephant (VI. 59.
14). Son of Sumālin and Ketu-Mati (VII. 5. 38-39).
Overwhelmed in the action against Māndhātā (VII 23 (c)
34). Accompanied Sumālin to fight against the Devas
(VII. 27. 28.)

AKOPA—A counsellor of Daśaratha (I. 7. 3)

AKṢA—A Rākṣasa, roughly handled by Hanumān
(I. 1. 75). Rāvaṇa's son Went out to fight with Hanumān at
the desire of Rāvaṇa Fought with Hanumān, but was killed at
the end (V. 47 1-36) समरोद्धतोन्मुखः (V 47 1). प्रतापवान्
काञ्चनचित्रकर्मकः (V. 47. 2). धीर्यवान् नैर्ऋतर्वमः (V 47. 3).
अमरतुल्यविक्रमः (V. 47. 6) हरीक्षणः (V 47 8. समाहितह्मा
(V. 47. 10). आशुपराक्रमः (V. 17 13) समाधिसंयोगविमोक्ष-
तत्त्वविद् (V. 17 14). रणचण्डविक्रमः प्रवृद्धनेजोदराधीर्यसायकः
(V. 47. 19). धीर्यदर्पितः क्षतजोपमेक्षणः (V 47. 20). रथिभ्रेष्ठवरः
(V. 47. 23).

AGASTYA—A Rṣi who with his brother dwelt in the Jaka forests. Rama during his exile paid a visit to them. He was invited by him. Rama came in possession of certain divine weapons (I 1 42—43). Rama's visit to him foreseen by him (I 3 19). Sunda having been killed by him. Tataka, her son, Marica rushed at him, but he changed them into 'śasas' ऋषिसत्तम, भगवान् ऋषि (I 20 10—13).

On the eve of his banishment, Rama instructed Lakṣmana to send valuable presents and some cows to him. ब्राह्मणोत्तम (I 32 13—14).

मुनिसत्तम (III 11 30) महर्षि धीमान् (III 11 32) ऋषिमुनि (III 11 37). With a desire to do good to humanity, cleared the Southern regions of demons (III 11 54). At the request of the Devas, ate away Vatapi the Asura and reduced to ashes his brother Ilvala (III 11 55—67). जेन्द्र दीप्ततेजा (III 11 66). His hermitage described (III 11 73—76 79—80 86 89—93). Made the Southern regions habitable by destroying the Rakasas (III 11 81—84). Stopped the growth of the Vindhya hills (III 11 85). इवेनैव कर्मणा लोके विद्यत (III 11 79) पुण्यकर्मा (III 11 81) दीर्घायु (III 11 86) लोके विश्रुतकर्मा (III 11 86) लोके चित साधु सता हिते नित्य रत (III 11 87). The disciple, instructed by Lakṣmana (III 12 1—4) entered the fire temple and announced the arrival of Rama (III 12 5—9). मुनिश्रेष्ठ तपसा दुष्प्रदर्श (III 12 6). Instantly asked him to show them in (III 12 9—12). Appeared before Rama etc. surrounded by disciples (III 12 21). भगवान्, तपसा निधान (III 12 23). Saluted by Rama etc. (III 12 24) offered them seats and received them formally (III 12 26—7). Honored Rama separately, for he was the king as well as a guest (III 12 28—30), and presented him with divine weapons (III 12 31—37). Praised highly the womanly qualities of Sita and the loyalty of Lakṣmana (III

13 1—8). अनल इव दीप्त (III 13 9) In reply to Rama's enquiry (III 13 10—11) suggested the name of Paravati, then described the route (III 13 12—22) सत्यवादी Gave leave to Rama etc to depart (III 13 23—24) भावितात्मा (III 15 12) Congratulated Rama on the destruction of Khara, and explained to him the mystery of Indra's visit to the hermitage of Śara bhanga (III 30 34—37) His annihilation of Vātapī referred to (III 43 42—44)

Lived near the Malaya hills आदित्यसकाश ऋषिसत्तम महात्मा Sugriva instructed Angada and others to propitiate him before proceeding further in quest of Sita (IV 41 15—16) Placed the Mahendra hills in the bosom of the sea (IV 41 20) Viśva karma built a mansion for him on the heights of the Kuñjara Hills (IV 41 34—36) Guardian deity of the South (IV 45 6)

Appeared before Rama on the eve of his final struggle with Ravana and communicated to him the victory yielding स्तव addressed to the Sun, and advised him to repeat it thrice before fighting with him (VI 105 1 27) His cultural conquest of the South referred to by Rama (VI 115 14)

Came to congratulate Rāma on his return home (VII 1 3) Requested the porter to inform Rāma that the Ṛṣis were waiting outside (VII 1 8 9) At the request of Rāma (VII 1 29—36), proceeded to narrate the life history of Indrajit (VII 2—30) कुम्भयोनि (VII 2 1) (VII 37 (b) 5) चेनाग्नि समविग्रह (VII 4 2) In reply to Rama's query (VII 4 1 7) described the history of the early Rākāsa settlers of Laṅkā (VII 4—8) In reply to Rāma's question (VII 10 1), described the austerities practised by Ravana etc (VII 10 2—49) In reply to Rāma's query (VII 23(c) 66—67) said that the island man was the Lord Kapila and the 30 crores were the reflections of his Great Soul (VIII 23 (c))

67—70). In reply to Rāma's enquiry (VII. 31. 1—4), described Rāvana's discomfitures (VII. 31. 5—34, 44). In reply to Rāma's query (VII. 35. 1—13) proceeded to describe how on account of an imprecation, Hanumān was not conscious of his strength (VII. 35. 14—36, 49). Asked for permission to retire (VII. 36. 51). Accepting Rāma's invitation, withdrew (VII. 36. 58—59). At the request of Rāma (VII. 37(a). 1—3), narrated the birth of Rkṣa-rāt, Valin and Sugriva (VII. 37(a). 3—59). Explained why Rāvana had abducted Sītā (VII. 37(b). 5—37(c). 28) in the words of Nārada (VII. 37(d). 1—9). Described the discomfiture of Rāvana at the hands of women of Śveta-dvīpa (VII. 37(e). 1—55). Retired (VII. 37(e). 61). Born of a pot in which Mitra and Varuṇa had deposited their energy, retreated soon after, saying to Mitra, "I am not your son" तेजोमयः, विप्रः, ऋषिसत्तमः (VII. 57. 4—5). Received the Devas warmly and honored them equally (VII. 76. 21). Receiving Rāma duly, congratulated him for having restored the Brāhmana's child to life, and offered to make a gift of a few ornaments to him (VII. 76. 25—33). In reply to Rāma's query (VII. 76. 33—36), proceeded to narrate an anecdote of the Tretā Age (VII. 76. 36). How he had seen a heavenly being feeding on a corpse in a lonely forest, and how out of curiosity he enquired why he ate such impure things (VII. 77. 1—20). Moved to hear Śveta's sad story (VII. 78. 1—25), accepted his gifts, thus paving his way to heaven (VII. 78. 26—29). In compliance with Rāma's wish (VII. 79. 1—3), described the story of Rājā Daṇḍa (VII. 79. 4—81. 20). As the evening came on, advised Rāma to say his evening prayers (VII. 81. 21—22) धर्मनेत्रः (VII. 82. 8). In reply to Rāma's application (VII. 82. 5—7) granted him permission to depart (VII. 82. 8—13). सत्यशिलः (VII. 82. 14).

AGASTYA'S BROTHER—Lived at the distance of 4 Yojaoas to the south of Sutiṣṇa's hermitage (III. 11. 37). His hermitage described by Rāma (III 11. 47-53). Rāma etc. on their way to Agastya's place broke their journey for a night there (III. 11. 69-70). Next morning with his permission left for Agastya's hermitage (III. 11. 71-73)

AGNI—At the desire of Brahman produced Nila (I 17. 13). On being vanquished by Bali waited on Viṣṇu (I. 29. 6). Requested by the Devas petrified the discharged energy of Mahādeva (I. 36. 17). Waited on Brahman along with other Devas to obtain a commander-in-chief (I. 37. 1-2) Referred to by Brahman to be the one who could bring about the birth of the commander of gods (I. 37. 7). Deputed by the Devas to bring about the birth of a son by depositing the energy of Mahādeva in Gangā (I. 37. 10-11). हुताशनः (I. 37. 11). पायकः (I 37. 12). Went to Gangā and asked her to bear the child to please the Devas (I. 37. 12). Gangā being ready (I 37.13) saturated her through and through (I. 37 14). Gangā pleading inability (I. 37.15) directed her to deposit the foetus by the side of the Himavān (I. 37. 17). सर्वदेवपुरोगमः (I. 37. 15). Elected Kārtikeya commander-in chief of the divine army (I. 37. 30). Requested by Indra to get his testicles restored (I. 49. 1), approached the Pitṛs for remedy (I. 49 5). Became nervous when Viśvāmitra wanted to hurl the Brahma weapon at Vasistha (I. 56 14) His protection invoked by Kausalyā on the eve of Rāma's exile (II. 25. 24) Agitated at the austerities of Maṇḍa-karni sent five Apsarās to create mischief (III. 11. 13-15). Greeted by Sītā on the appearance of Hanumān as Rāma's messenger (V. 32. 14). His temple at Agastya's hermitage visited by Rāma (III. 12 17). His protection invoked by Sītā in favour of Hanumān (V. 53. 25-28). Begot Sannādana on a Gandharva girl. रुष्णधर्मन (VI. 27. 20). Came out of the

fire placing Sita on the lap and testifying to her spotless character, and advised Rama to accept her as his wife (VI 118 1 10) लोकस्य साक्षी (VI 118 5) On the destruction of Lavana (VII 6^o 36) appeared before Śatrughna ready to grant boons (VII 70 1 3) Disappeared after granting him the boon (VII 70 6 7) Congratulated Rāma on the death of Śambhaka (VII 76 5 6) On the flight of Indra (VII 85 15 16), approached Viṣṇu (VII 85 17) Paid his respects to Viṣṇu (VII 110 13)

AGNI KETU—A Rakṣasa chief who in Ravana's court stood ready with his arms to kill Rama etc (VI 9 2) fought with Rama (VI 43 11) Killed by Rāma (VI 43 26 27) दुर्घर्ष (Ibid)

AGNI VARṂA—Son of Sudarśana and father of Śighra ga (I 70 40—41)

ANGAS, THE—Ruled over by Romapada (I 9 8) Stricken with drought (I 9 9) So called, because Kandarpa when reduced to ashes by Māha Deva, cast off his body (अङ्गम्) here (I 23 10—14) Daśaratha offered the produce of——to appease the wrath of Kaikeyi II 11 37—36) Sugriva asked Vinata to go there in quest of Sita (IV 40 23)

ANGADA—Son of Vālm and Tara, the Crown Prince While he went into the forests, the spies informed him about the alliance between Sugriva and Rama This fact he reported to Tara (IV 15 15—18) गुह्यज्येष्ठ कनकागदः (IV 18 50) बाल अकृतबुद्धि एकपुत्र मे प्रिय (IV 18 52) Vālm on his death bed asks Rama to take care of him (IV 18 50—53) धीरः सुकुमार सुयोचित (IV 20 17) प्रियचारुवेद (20 24) Sugriva asked by the dying Vālm to take care of him on his death (IV 22 8—15) सुग्रीवस्य तुल्यपराक्रम (IV 22 11) तेजस्वी तरुण (IV 22 12) Advised by his dying father

to follow the wishes of Sugriva (IV. 22. 20—23) पिङ्गाक्षः (IV. 23. 22). Asked by his mother touched the feet of the dead Vālm repeating his name (IV. 23. 22—25). सुजनः सुयशः (IV. 24. 20). Asked by Lakṣmaṇa to bring garlands, cloths, oil, ghee etc. (IV. 25. 16). Helped Sugriva in placing the corpse of Vālm in the palanquin (IV. 25. 28) Embraced by the weeping Tārā and other ladies of the harem (IV. 25. 33—34). With a heavy heart placed the dead body of his father on the pyre, set fire to it and walked solemnly round it and then along with others performed the तर्पण ceremony (IV. 25. 49—53) वीरः (IV. 26. 12). ज्येष्ठः सदृशः विक्रमेण च श्रद्धीनात्मा (IV. 26. 13). Appointed yuvarāja by Sugriva at the desire of Rāma (IV. 38) Became perturbed at seeing Lakṣmaṇa advancing towards him angrily (IV. 31. 31) At Lakṣmaṇa's request (IV. 31. 32—34), hurried to announce him (IV. 31. 35). संभ्रान्तभावः परदीनवक्तुः तरस्वी Did so after saluting Rāma, Tārā and Sugriva (IV. 31. 36—37) Lakṣmaṇa passed by his well furnished house in Kīrkadhā (IV. 33. 9) Joined Sugriva with 1000 Padmas and 100 Śaṅkhas of Vānaras (IV. 39. 29. 30). Sugriva appointed him as the geocal of the contingent going to the South in search of Sitā (IV. 45. 6). Accompanied Hanumān to the south (IV. 48. 1) Searched the Vindhya for nothing (IV. 48. 2—6) Killed a mighty Asura in the water-less and tree-less tract (IV. 48. 7—23) Finding his companions dispirited, proposed that they should once more ransack the soothern parts in search of Sitā for fear of Sugriva and Rāma (IV. 49. 1—10) महाप्राज्ञ (IV. 49. 1) Once more searched in vain the Vindhya forests and the Rajata hills till overtaken with fatigue (IV. 49. 15—23) Having ransacked the Vindhya, entered the Rkṣa cave in search of water (IV. 50. 1—8) सिंहद्वयस्कन्धः पीनायनमुजः (IV.

53. 7). When coming out of Rkṣa cave he discovered that the time allotted by Sugriva was already past, proposed to die of starvation on the sea side as Sugriva would never tolerate the failure of the expedition (IV. 53 7—19).

बुद्ध्या ह्यष्टांगया युक्तः, चतुर्वैलसमन्वितः चतुर्दशगुणः तेजो-
बलपराक्रमेः शश्वच्च आपूर्यमाणः श्रिया शुक्लपक्षादो वर्धमानः
शशाच बुद्ध्या बृहस्पतिसमः विक्रमे पितुः सदृशः (IV 54 2 4).
Vehemently condemned the faults of Sugriva and along
with his companions undertook to die of starvation (IV 55
1—23) On finding Sampātī drawing towards them bemoaned
their lot and praised Jaiāyus for his whole hearted devotion
to Rāma's cause (IV 56 6—16) In reply to Sampātī's
enquiries introduced himself, described the death of Jaiāyus
and the circumstances that had led the Vānaras to take to
fasting (IV 57 4—19) Anxiously asked Sampātī to
direct the Vānaras to Rāvana's place of refuge (IV 58
8—10) Finding his followers dejected at the sight of the
roaring sea tried to rouse their courage (IV 64 8—10).
Next day, held again a council and asked the Vānaras who
could save their lives and limbs from being destroyed by
Sugriva, by leaping across the sea, to come forward (IV 64
11—19) When everyone kept quiet, exhorted them to
speak out (IV 64 20—22) Told in the council that he
could certainly jump a hundred yojanas but was not sanguine
if he could return (IV 65 18—19 सत्यचिक्रमः परन्तपः
(IV 65 26) In reply to Jambavān's contention that he
must allow his servants to try the game first (IV 65
20—27), said that if nobody was ready to go then they
should once more take to fasting, for they could not return
home without having located the whereabouts of Sita (IV,
65 28—32) On the return of Hanuman paid him high
compliments (V 57 44—48) Sat down on the Mahendra
hills along with Hanuman, surrounded by the Vānaras (V.

57. 49—53). After Hanumān's speech (V. 59. 1—32) proposed to release Sītā by vanquishing the Rākṣasas without giving any previous information to Rāma and Sugrīva (V. 60. 1—13). Approving the proposal of Jāmbavān (V. 60. 14—20) took his way home (V. 61. 1—2) Gave permission to his companions to drink honey of the Madhu-vana, when they prayed for it (V. 61. 11—12). धीमान् (V. 61. 13). Gave free license to the Vānaras to drink (V. 62. 2—4) On hearing the message delivered by Dadhi-mukha (V. 64. 1—12) proposed that they should go to Sugrīva without delay (V. 64. 12—17). His proposal having been approved (V. 64. 18—22) went to Sugrīva by the aerial route followed by the Vānaras (V. 64. 23—26). Approached Sugrīva leading the party of Vānaras and then bowed to Sugrīva and Rāma (V. 64. 40—41). Carried Lakṣmaṇa on his shoulders during his expeditionary march to the South (VI. 4. 19). In reply to Rāma's request (VI. 17. 31—33) suggested that they should examine well Bibhisana before taking him in (VI. 17. 38—4.). मतिमान् (VI. 17. 38). Guessed that Śuka was a spy and as such he should be confined (VI. 20. 29—30). Placed in charge of the centre of the invading army (उरसि) VI. 24. 14) गिरिशृंगप्रतीकाशः पद्मकिङ्कटकसन्निभः (VI. 26. 15). Son of Indra (VI. 30. 24) Was to lead the attack against the southern gate defended by Mahodara and Mahā Pārśva (VI. 37. 27) Pursuant to Rāma's order entered Lankā and presented the ultimatum to Rāvana in open court on behalf of Rāma (VI. 41. 73—81). आत्मवान् (VI. 41. 85). Hearing the command of Rāvana (VI. 73. 82—83), allowed the Rākṣasas to capture him, when they had done so he leaped up along with his captors, then demolishing the pinnacle of Rāvana's place, returned to his own camp by the aerial route (VI. 41. 84—91). Fought a duel with Indrajit (VI. 43. 6) Smashed to pieces the chariot of Indrajit with his club (VI. 43. 19). Dismounted Indrajit by destroying his chariot and the

driver, hence applauded by the Devas and the sages (VI 44 28—29) At Rāma's desire went up (VI 45 1—3) to discover the position taken up by Indrajit, but foiled (VI 45 4—5) Repaired where Rāma and Lakṣmana were lying senseless (VI 46 3) Wounded by Indrajit (VI 46 21) Carefully guarded the Vanara army (VI 47 2—4) In reply to Sugriva's query (VI 50 1) told him that the cause of the flight of the Vanaras was the condition of Rāma and Lakṣmana (VI 50 2—3) Finding that the Rākṣasas under Yajña danṣṭra were creating a havoc in the Vanara army, annihilated the Rākṣasas (VI 53 27—32) Finding the Vanara army hard pressed by Vajra danṣṭra, fought a contestual duel with Vajradanṣṭra—in the course of which he uncharioted him, exchanged fists and fought with broad sword and shield, till he killed his opponent (VI 54 16—37) Killed Kumbha hanu (VI 58 23) Guarded the gate at the desire of Rāma (VI 61 37) Finding the Vanara chiefs panic stricken at sight of Kumbha karna (VI 66 3) tried to rouse their spirit by delivering a harangue (VI 66 4—7) Finding the Vanara army flying in disorder once more rallied it delivering a harangue (VI 66 18—32) Fought a duel with Kumbha karna till stunned by a blow fell down (VI 67 42—49) वज्रहस्तात्मजात्मज (VI 67 42) युद्धमार्गे विशारद. (VI 67 47) In obedience to Sugriva's order (VI 69 81—82) fought a duel with Navantaka and killed him with his horse (VI 69 83—94) Congratulated by the Devas, became gratified with his achievement (VI 69, 95—96) Simultaneously attacked by Devantaka, Trisira Mahodara (VI 70 1—4), bravely defended himself till rescued by Nila and Hanuman (VI 70 5—20) Wounded by Indrajit (VI 73 45) Fought a duel with Kampana and killed him (VI 76 1—3) Fought with Śanītakṣa broke to pieces his bow, then snatching away his sword mortally wounded him (VI 76 4—10) Fought single handed

with Prajaṅgha, Yārpuṅkṣa and Śoṇitākṣa (VI. 76. 14—15). Killed Prajaṅgha in a duel (VI. 76. 18.—27). Fought a duel with Kumbha but was badly wounded (VI. 76. 46—55). Joined Lakṣmaṇa while he went to fight against Indrājit (VI. 85. 35). Fought a duel with Mahā-Pārśva when his army was hard pressed and at last killed him (VI. 98. 1—22). Greeted Rāma on the death of Rāvaṇa (VI. 108. 33). Received costly शङ्खद्वय on the occasion of Rāma's coronation (VI. 128. 77). Caressed and honored by Rāma (VII. 39. 16—19). Succeeded Sugrīva in Kiṣkindhā (VII. 108. 22).

ĀṄGADA—Son of Lakṣmaṇa. धर्मविशारदः दृढविक्रमः (VII. 102. 2). Made King of Kārupatha (VII. 102. 11).

. ĀṄGADIYĀ—Capital of Kārupatha, ruled over by Āṅgada. Founded by Rāma. रम्या पुरी, रमणीया, सुगुप्ता (VII. 102. 8).

ĀṄGA—LEPĀ—A town of the West. Sugrīva sent Suṣeṇa etc. there in search of Sitā (IV. 42. 14).

ĀṄGĀRAKA—A Rākṣasi of the Southern Seas who drew her victims by means of their shadows (IV. 41. 26). Sugrīva asked Āṅgada to search carefully these places for Sitā (IV. 41. 27).

ĀṄGIRASA—A Prajāpati who came after Pulastya (III. 14. 8).

His descendants cursed Hanūmān for creating mischief in the hermitage (VII. 36. 32—34). Invited to a sacrificial session convened by Rājā Nimi (VII. 55. 9).

AJĀ—Son of Nābhāṅga, and father of Daśaratha (I. 70. 43).

AṅJANA, THE—Hills. Sugrīva asked Hanūmān to send for the Vānaras living there (IV. 37. 5). 3 krores came thence (IV. 37. 20).

AṅJANA—A regional elephant (VII. 31. 36).

ANJANA—अप्सरसां श्रेष्ठा, विद्याता अप्सरा, alias पुञ्जिक-
 स्थला wife of the Vānara chief Kesari विद्याता त्रिषु लोकेषु
 स्वेणाप्रतिमा भुवि, कामरूपिणी । On account of a curse was
 born as the daughter of the Vānara chief Kuñjara One day
 while she was loitering about on the hills in the form of a
 human being, Vāyu stripped her naked and had an
 intercourse with her in mind Hanumān was the child
 of this union She safely delivered him in a lonely
 cave (IV. 66 8—20) Raped by Rāvaṇa while on her
 way to Brahman's place (VI 13 11—12) Hence cursed
 Rāvaṇa (VI 60 11) Daughter of Varuṇa (Ibid)
 Wife of Kesari gave birth to Hanumān

ATI-KAYA—अतिविवृद्धकायः, विख्यास्तमहेन्द्रकल्पः, धन्वी,
 अतिरथ, अतिवीरः Accompanied Ravana to the battle field
 twanging his bow (VI 59 16) Nephew of Kumbha karaṇa
 who mourned the loss of his uncle (VI 68 7). On
 hearing the words of Tnāra (VI 69 1—7), offered to
 go to the battle field (VI 69 9) शक्तुल्यपराक्रम, वीरः,
 अन्तरिक्षगतः, मायाविशारदः, त्रिदशदर्पण, समरदुर्मदः, सुबल
 सम्पन्नः, विस्तोर्णकीर्तिः, never suffered a defeat, अह्नवित्,
 युद्धविशारदः, प्रवरविज्ञान, लब्धवरः, शत्रुवत्तादन, भास्कर-
 तुल्यदर्शनः (VI 69 10—14) Son of Ravana, went to
 the battle field taking leave of Ravana (VI 69 17—19)
 अतितेजस्वी drove in an armoured car, well armed and
 surrounded by numerous warriors (VI 69 25—28)
 ब्रह्मदत्तवरः, अद्रिसकाश, देवदानवदर्पहा (VI 71 3) When all
 his companions were killed got angry and made a rush
 at the Vānara army putting them to flight (VI 71 1—9)
 हरिलोचनः driving in a chariot drawn by a thousand horses
 (VI 71 12) The car protected by armours, held a great bow
 and sharp arrows in his hands, with two broad swords
 hanging on either side रक्तकण्ठगुणः, धीरः, महापर्वतसन्निभ

(VI. 71. 12.—24). वृद्धसेवी ध्रुतयलः सर्वान्निबिडुपां वरः (VI. 71. 28) अश्वपृष्ठे नागपृष्ठे खड्गे धनुषि कर्पणे । मेदे सान्त्वे च दाने च नये मन्त्रे च सम्मतः (VI 71. 29). Son of Dhānya Mālo and Rāvann (VI. 71. 30). By means of asceticism so far pleased Brahman that he presented him with weapons, divine armours and a shining car (VI 31—32) Vanquished hundreds of Devas and Danavas including Indra and Varuṇa (VI 71 33—34). Twanging his bow plunged into the thick of the Vānara army, then defeating Divida Mainda etc challenged the heroes alone to come and fight with him (VI. 71 37—45). Seeing Lakṣmaṇa standing before him (VI 71. 46—49), ironically advised him to stand back as he did not care to fight with boys (VI 71 50—56) Fought a hard contested duel with Lakṣmaṇa but killed (VI 766—105) Accompanied Sumāti to the battle field to fight against the Devas (VII. 27. 31)

ATI-MUKHA—A Vānara chief, created by gods to help Rāma (VII 36 48)

ATRI—Rama in exile went to his hermitage from Chitrakūṭa accompanied by Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā. Received them like his own children महायशः भगवान् (II 117 5) Looked after the arrangements of hospitality personally and received courteously Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā (II 117. 6) Asked the ascetic's wife Anasūya to take care of Sita अपिसत्तम. (II 117. 8) धर्मज्ञः सर्वभूतहिते रतः (II 117. 7) In glowing terms introduced Anasūyā to Rāma and asked Sita to approach her (II 117. 9—13). कुलपतिः सूर्यशेखररोषम (VI 123. 48) Went from the south to greet Rāma on his return home (VII 1 3). Invited by Rājā Nimi to act as a priest in a sacrificial session (VII 55 9)

ATRI—A great sage of the north who came to greet Rāma on his return home (VII 1 5)

ADITI—Gave birth to Indra (I. 18. 12). Wife of Kasyapa, practised austerities for 1000 years (I. 29. 10—11). Viṣṇu born as Vamana from her (I. 29. 19). The mother of the Devas (I. 45. 38). Prayed for the success of Indra while he was fighting with the Asuras (II. 25. 34). Daughter of Dakṣa (III. 14. 10). By favor of her husband, became the mother of 33 Vedic deities (III. 14. 13—15) (VII. 11. 15).

ANARANYA महतेजाः, प्रतापवान् Son of Bāna and father of Prithu (I. 70. 23—24). Predicted root-and branch destruction of Ravana's family at the hands of one of his descendants (Rāma) (VI. 60. 8—10). Accepting the challenge of Ravana (VII. 19. 7—8) fought with him, but was defeated and killed, and with his last breath pronounced the curse (VII. 19. 9—32).

ANALA—A Rākṣasa follower of Bibhiṣaṇa who assuming the form of a bird spied the defence organisation and fighting strength of the Rākṣasas (VI. 37. 7—19). Son of Mahi and Vasudā (VII. 5. 41—43).

ANALĀ—A daughter of Dakṣa and wife of Kaśyapa (III. 14. 10—12) gave birth to all the fruit bearing trees (III. 14. 31).

ANALĀ—A Rākṣasi, daughter of Mālyavān and Sundarī (VII. 5. 34—36). Wife of Viśvāvasu and mother of Kumbhinasa (VII. 61. 16).

ANĀṄGA—A Vanara chief, son of Agni (हृताशन); Sugriva wanted to send him to the South in search of Sītā (IV. 41. 4).

ANANTA DEVA—सर्वदेवनमस्कृतः, सहस्रशिरः, नीलवा-
स्तः } Dwelt at the top of the Jāta rōpa-sila hills (IV. 40. 52),
towards the east of whose golden altar there was a three-
leaved palm tree planted by the gods (IV. 40. 53—54).

ANILA—Son of Māli and Vasudā and a counsellor of Bibhīṣaṇa (Vff. 5. 41-43).

ANASŪYĀ—Her presentation of ornaments to and conversation with Sitā—foreseen by Vālmīki (I. 3. 18).

Wife of the sage Atri, वृद्धा, सत्कृता (II. 117. 7). महाभागा, तापसी, धर्मचारिणी (II. 117. 8). Asked by Atri to take away Sitā (II. 117. 8). Introduced to Rāma by Atri (ff. 117. 9-12). During a ten years' drought saved the lives of the people by diverting the course of the Gaṅgā, thus helping the fruits and roots to grow; practised penances for 10,000 years and extended the length of one night to cover the period of ten nights by the might of her asceticism (ff. 117. 9-12) सर्वभूतानां नमस्कार्या, अक्रोधना (II. 113. 13). शिथिला, वलिता वृद्धा, जरापाण्डुरमूर्धजा, सततं वेपमानांगी (II. 117. 18). Saluted by Sitā पतिव्रता (II. 117. 19). Courteously received Sitā and congratulated her for her extreme devotion to Rāma under all conditions (II. 117. 21-29) Being extremely pleased with Sitā for her fine sense of duty offered to grant her a boon (II. 118. 13-15). Overjoyed at her selflessness, presented her with an ever-green garland, anointment and unguent etc. (II. 118. 17-20). When Sitā began to praise her profusely, in order to change the topic asked her to describe her marriage ceremony (II. 118. 23-25). दृढ़व्रता (II. 118. 23). Extremely delighted at the story, at evening fall permitted her to go to Rāma. At the same time requested her to put on the dresses and paints presented by her (II. 119. 1-11). Saluted by Sitā before she left her (II. 119. 12).

ANUHLADA.—A Dānava who abducted Śaci deceitfully. Killed by Indra for this offence (IV. 39-6-7).

ANDHRA.—A country in the South Sugriva asked Angada to go there in search of Sitā (IV. 41-12).

ANDHAKA —Name of a Daitya killed by Rudra in Svetitanya (III 30 27) (VI 13 6)

APARA PARVATA —Name of a hill traversed by Bharata on his way back from Kekaya (II 71 3)

APSARAS, THE —Annihilated by Ravana while playing in the groves of the Nandana (I 15 23) Praised Visnu when their prayer (I 15 19 26) was granted (I 15. 32) The Devas were instructed to produce Vanaras on them (I 17 5) Danced merrily on the birth of Ravana etc (I 16 17) Followed the course of Ganga (I 43 32) 6 crores along with numerous maidens churned up from the sea वरुणिय । Being claimed neither by the Devas, nor by the Danavas, they became public property (I, 45 32 35) Were pleased at the expiation of Ahalya's sin (I 49 19) Danced on the occasion of Rama's marriage (I 73 38) Assembled to witness the contest between Rama and Parasurama (I 76 10) Requested by Bharadvjya (II 91 16) entertained the retinue of Bharata (II 91 26) 20 000 came from the Nandana Park in response to his prayer (II 91 45) Five deputed by the Devas to disturb the ascetic virtues of the Rsi Māṇḍa Karpī विद्युत्कलितचंस (III 11 15) They won the Rsi's heart and lived under waters of the Paścāpsara tank as his wives (III 11 11 19) दिव्याभरणमालया दिव्यरूपा ऋषीडास्तविधिज्ञा (III 35 16) उद्याधचताम्रचूडा विचित्रवेशा (IV 24 34)

Haunted the Lake Sudarāṇa for the sake of pleasure (IV 40 46) Haunted the Mahendra Hills (IV 41 22) Haunted the lake on the Kailasa hills near Kuvera's mansions (IV 43 22) Lived permanently in the Krodha Sea (IV 46 15) Went into raptures when Indrajit was killed (VI 90 75) Danced with joy (VI 90 85) Witnessed the wonderful combat between Rama and Ravana (VI 107 51) Danced on the occasion of Rama's coronation (VI 128 71)

Used to disturb Pulastya by visiting the hermitage of Tṛṣṇabindu (VII 2 9 12) But made themselves scarce when he pronounced a curse on them (VII 2 13 14) Frequent the banks of the Mandakini (VII 11 42) Sang sweetly in Kuvera's mansion (VII 26 9) Sang for joy when Indra went out to fight Ravana (VII 28 26) Visit the Vindhya along with their womenfolk (VII 31 16) Greatly disconcerted at the discomfiture of Śatrughna (VII 69 13), When Śatrughna drew out the divine arrow to kill Lavana (VII 69 16 19), losing the balance of mind approached Brahman (VII 69 20 21) On the destruction of Lavana (VII 69 36), breathed freely (VII 69 39) Showered flowers on Lakṣmana (VII 106 16) Crowded the bank of the Saraya (VII 110 7) Expressed their joy on the return of Viṣṇu (VII 110 14)

ABHIKALA —A village on the way to Kekaya passed by Vasiṣṭha's messengers (II 68 17)

AMARĀVATĪ — The residential town of Indra (III 48 10)

AMRTA —Sought after by the Devas and the Dānavas as the sovereign remedy against death and decay (I 45 16) Obtained by churning the Kṣiroda Sea (I 45 17—18) On being produced the Devas and the Dānavas fell out for possession (I 45 40) Removed by Viṣṇu (I 45 42) Sampātī lived in the times when it was churned out (IV 58 13) Churned out of the sea into which the Vanaras had thrown medicinal herbs (IV 66 13) Produced from the milk of Surabhi (VII 23 23)

AMBARĪṢA—King of Ayodhya His sacrifice interrupted because of the theft of the horse by Indra (I 61 5—6) The priests asked him to substitute a human being for the lost animal (I 61 6—8) पुरुषर्पण (I 61 9) महादुष्टि Rnamed about for a human victim (I 61 9—10)

At last came across Reika who dwelt in Bhrgutunga, with his wife and three children (I 61 11—15) The father and the mother refusing to sell the eldest and the youngest sons respectively, bought Sunahsepa for a large sum of money (I 61 16—23) राजर्षि, नदातेजा, महायज्ञा (I 61 24) Started for Ayodhya with the victim in a chariot (I 61 24) Broke his journey at Puškara one noon (I 62 1) राजर्षि (I 62 21) Returned soon to the sacrificial area and completed the sacrifice by favor of Indra (I 62 23—27) Son of Praśuśruka and father of Nabaśu (I 70 41—42)

AYODHYA—Rama went to—(I 1 86) Rama's journey foreseen by Valmiki (I 3 37) Described in detail (I 5 5—23) Inhabitants (I 6 6—19) Defences (I 6 21—28) Public reception accorded to Daśaratha and Rāyāśruga (I 11 25—27) Festivities at—on the birth of Rama etc (I 18 18—20) The messengers sent by Janaka arrived at—(I 68 1) Public reception of the newly married princes (I 77 6—8) Richly decorated on the occasion of Rama's consecration (II 5 15—21 6 11—19) Shook when Rama went into exile (II 41 12 20) Its miserable appearance (II 42 23) Fondly remembered by Rāma (II 46 4) Ceased to be beautiful when Rama left it (II 47 17—18) (II 48 34 37) Rama took leave of—(II 50 1—3) अनुवर्जनापत्तौ सुखालोकप्रियावहा (II 51 16) Described (II 51 21—23) Gloomy appearance described by Sumantra (II 59 10—16) Its deserted appearance described by Bharata (II 71 18—29 37—43) Unprotected as the town was still defended by the might of Rama (II 88 23—25) Rama's anxious enquiries about the well being of the city to Bharata (II 100 40—42) Bharata returns from Citra Kuṣa to—(II 113 23) Its deserted appearance described (II 114 2—29) शुभा

(III 62.15). Remembered by the exiled Rāma (IV.28.56). Return of Rāma. Saluted by the Vānaras and the Rākṣasas. पाण्डुरहर्म्यमालिना, विशालकट्या, गजवाजिभिर्वृता (VI. 123. 52—54). Deserted on the departure of Rāma, once more flourished at the time of Rsabha (VII. 111. 10).

AYO-MUKHA—The Hills in the South धातुमण्डितः, विचित्रशिखरः, श्रीमान्, चित्रपुष्पितकाननः, सुचन्दनवनोद्देशः । Sugriva asked Angada to go there in search of Sita (IV. 41 13-14).

AYO-MUKHI—महारूपा, राक्षसी, विरुतानना (III 69. 11) अल्पसत्त्वानां भयदा, योभक्ता, सौद्रदर्शना, लम्बोदरी, तीक्ष्णदंष्ट्रा, कराली, परुषत्वक् (III. 69. 12). विकटा, मुक्तमूर्धजा, devouring fierce stags (III 69. 13). Seen by Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa near the fissure in the vicinity of the hermitage of Matanga (III. 69 11). Disfigured by Lakṣmaṇa for having made advances to him (III. 69. 13-18).

ARAJĀ—Daughter of Uśnoā the Bhārgava, रूपेणाप्रतिमा मुचि, अनुत्तमा, कन्या (VII. 80 4-5). Refused to comply with Daṇḍa's request (VII. 80. 1-6) and instructed him to approach her father if he wanted to have her at all (VII 80. 7-12) Raped by Daṇḍa (VII. 80 13 17). Waited near the hermitage for the return of her father (VII. 80. 18) In obedience to her father's wish (VII. 81. 13-15) consented to do penitentiary rites for life (VII. 81. 16).

ARIṢṬA—A hill in Lātākā Described (V. 56 26-37). On his return journey, Hanumān climbed on it for leaping across the sea (V. 56 37) The hill shook under his weight, its denizens fled and it was levelled to the ground when Hanumān took his start (V. 56 42-50). 10 Yojanas in length and 30 in height (V 56. 50).

ARIṢṬA-NEMI—Father of Sumati—the younger queen of Sagara (I. 38. 4) A Prajā-pati who came after

Vivasvān (III. 14. 9) मुनिः Consulted by Budha with regard to Ila (VII 90. 5)

ARUNA—Son of Vinatā and brother of Garuḍa (III 14 32) Father of Jaṭāyus and Sampātī (III. 14 33)

ARUNDHATĪ—Her devotion to her husband extolled by Sitā चरिष्या सर्वनारीणाम् (II. 118 11) The devoted wife of Vasistha (V 24. 10)

ARKA—A Vānara chief who defended the flank of the invading army during its march to the South (VI 4 33)

ARCIṢMAN—A Vanara chief whom Sugriva proposed to send to the west in search of Sitā (IV 42 3)

ARCI MĀLYAS The—Vānara chiefs whom Sugriva wanted to send to the west in search of Sitā महाबलः (IV 42. 4)

ARJUNA—(Kartavīrya) Killed Jāmadagni—father of Parśurāma (I 75 24) Killed by Viṣṇu (VII 6 35) Repaired to the Narmadā for holiday making when Ravana called upon him (VII 31 7-10). As powerful as the Fire-God, always propitiated Him with the blood of his enemies (VII 31 8) At a little distance from Rāvana, was engaged in water-sports with his womenfolk, when in a playful mood, checked the flow of the Narmadā with his thousand arms thus causing an overflow of the river water that washed away the flowers offered to Śiva by Rāvana (VII 32 1 7) On hearing the report of the struggle between Rāvana's courtiers and his own, and the defeat of the latter (VII 32 37), proceeded to set matters right after consoling his girls, fought with and disabled Prabhasta and put to flight Rāvana's courtiers (VII 32 38—48), then fighting a duel with Rāvana, made him a captive and took him to his capital (VII 32 49 73) Received formally Pulastya and asked him what he could do to please him (VII 33 5 12) In

compliance with his request (VII. 33 13-16), released Ravana honoring him with valuable gifts and contracting an alliance with him in the presence of fire (VII 33 17-18)

ARTHA-SADHAKA—A courtier of Bharata who went out to receive Rāma on his return (VI. 127. 11)

ARYAMĀ—His protection invoked by Kauśalya during Rāma's sojourn (II 25 8)

ALAKṢITA The—A forest in the west Sugriva asked Susena etc to go there in search of Sitā (IV 42 14)

ALAMBUṢA—Wife of Ikṣvāku and mother of Viśiṭa (I 47 11 12) Her help prayed for by Bharadvaja in the matter of entertaining the army of Bharata (II 91 17) Danced in the presence of Bharata at the latter's request (II 91 47)

ALARKA—The Rājā who gave his eyes to a Brāhmana in fulfilment of a promise made—referred to by Kaikeyi (II 12 43) तेजस्वी (II 14 5)

AVANTĪ—(i) A town in the South Sugriva asked Angada to go there in search of Sitā (IV. 41 10)

(ii) A town in the west Sugriva sent Susena etc there in search of Sitā (IV 42 14)

AVINDHYA—A favourite counsellor of Ravana मेधावी, विद्वान्, राक्षसपु गय , धृतिमान्, ज्ञेयमान्, वृद्धः, (V 37. 12) His advice to Ravana regarding Sitā's release rejected (V 37 13)

AŚVINI PRABHĀ—A Rākṣasa chief who fought a duel with Davida (VI 43 12) killed (VI 43 32 34)

AŚOKA—A messenger despatched by Vasīṣṭha to bring back Bharata on the death of Daśaratha (II. 68 5) Reached Kākaya (II 70 1) Well received by the Rājā and the prince, approached Bharata, delivered Vasīṣṭha's message

and handed over the presents to him (II. 70. 2-5). Replied to Bharata's enquiries and requested him to make haste (II. 70. 11-12). Went out to receive Rama on his return (VI. 127. 11). Ordering the citizens to be ready to receive Rāma, went out to receive him (VI. 128. 23-26).

ASOKA PARK, The—confinement of Sita there at the order of Rāvaṇa (III. 56-32). सर्वकामफलैर्वृक्षैर्नाना-पुष्पफलैर्वृता, सर्वकामदैः द्विजैः समुपसेविता (III. 56. 33). Rāvaṇa's famous gardens in Lankā. चनिका महती महाद्रुमा (V. 13. 53). Hanumān resolved to go there in search of Sita (V. 13. 53-56). पुण्या सर्वसंस्कारसंस्कृता (V. 13. 60). पुष्पिताग्राः विविधाः द्रुमाः (V. 14. 2). आश्रयनसम्पन्ना लताशत-समन्विता वृक्षयादिका (V. 14. 4). विहगैः अभिनादिता, राजितैः काञ्चनैश्चैव पादपैः वृता (V. 14. 5). विहगैः मृगसंघैश्च विचित्रा चित्रकानना (V. 14. 6). पुष्पोपगुफलोपगैः वृक्षैः वृता, कोकिलैः भृंगराजैः मच्चैः नित्यनिषेविता (V. 14. 7). नानादिजगणायुता (V. 14. 8). Abounding in tanks, lakes and rivers (V. 14. 22-26). Back-ground furnished by a lofty hill clad in trees and furnished with retiring-rooms with a river flowing down (V. 14. 27-31). Nearby there was a lake on the banks of which stood a series of palaces built by Viśva-Karman (V. 14. 32-34). दिव्यगन्धरसेपेता सर्वतः समलंकृता (V. 15. 2). हर्म्यप्रासादसंवाधा कोकिलाकुलनिःस्वना (V. 15. 3). काञ्चनेतपल-पद्माभिर्वापीभिरुपशोभिता, यद्भूमिगुहायुता (V. 15. 4). सर्वर्तुकुसुमैः रम्यैः फलयद्भिः च पादपैः (शोभिता) (V. 15. 5). Described (V. 15. 2-15). In the heart of that garden there was a चैत्यप्रासाद that stood on a thousand pillars (V. 15. 16-18). Described (V. 18. 6-9). प्रमदायनम् (V. 18. 27). नेत्रमनःकान्ता (V. 41. 10). Destroyed by Hanumān (V. 41. 14-20).

ASVA—name of a sage to whose hermitage the sages of Janasthāna moved, when oppressed by the Rākṣasas (II. 116. 20).

ĀŚVA-GRĪVA—Son of Kaśyapa and Danu (III. 14. 16).

ĀŚVA-PATI—uncle of Bharata. Treated him as his own son during his sojourn at Kelaya (II. 1. 2). Honoured Vasiṣṭha's messengers (II. 70. 2). Before departure Bharata took leave of him (II. 70. 14-18). Gave him costly presents (II. 70. 19-23). Bade him farewell (II. 70. 28). His welfare enquired after by Kaikeyi from Bharata (II. 72. 6). परन्तपः (II. 72. 9) धर्मराजः, श्रीमान् (II. 74. 9)

ĀSVINS, THE TWO—At the request of Brahman produced two Vānara chiefs, Mainda and Divida (I. 17. 14). Included in the list of 33 Vedic Gods;—sons of Kaśyapa and Aditi (III. 14. 14-15). Sallied forth to fight Rāvaṇa (VII. 27. 22). Accompanied Indra to fight with Rāvaṇa (VII. 28. 27)

ĀŚMA TOWN—The city in the nether world inhabited by the Kālākeya Dānavas. Occupied by Rāvaṇa (VII. 23. 17-19)

ĀṢṬACALA—The name of a hill lying to the west on the other side of the seas. Sugriva asked Hanumān to send for the Vānaras living there (IV. 37. 3). 10 krores came thence (IV. 37. 21). Visited by Sugriva during his flight from Vālin's wrath (IV. 46. 19)

ĀṢṬĀ VAKRA—Finally emancipated Kahola (VI. 119. 16)

ĀSAMĀÑJA—Son of Sagara and Keśinī (I. 38. 16), (I. 70. 38). Made fun of his younger brothers by dipping them in the water of the Saraya पापसमाचारः, सजनप्रतियाधकः. Banished by the King for oppressing the people. Father of Amśumān (I. 38. 21-22). His banishment described in detail by Siddhartha (II. 36. 19-30)

ĀSITA—Son of Bharata, whose enemies were the Kings of the Haihayas, Tāla-janghas, and Śaka-bindus (I.

70 27-28) Being defeated retired to the Himālayas with two of his wives, where he died (I 70 29 30) At the time both of his wives were in the family way. One of them Kāṇḍī, gave birth to Sagara, by favour of the Rṣi Cyavana (I 70 30 37)

ASURAS, THE—Rāma requested by the Rṣis of the Daṇḍaka forest to kill them (I 1 44) Rāvaṇa excelled them in strength (I 15 9) killed by the weapons produced by Dakṣa's daughters, Jayā and Suprabhā (I 21 13 17) Failed to bend Janaka's bow (I 31 9) Being hit hard by the tools of Sagara's sons their dying wails rent the sky (I 39 20) Approaching Brahman complained against the conduct of Sagara's sons (I 39 23 26) कामरूपि विशिनायना (III 11 60) विप्रवातिन (III 11 63) Those dwelling in the islands used to draw their victims by means of their shadows by order of Brahman (IV 40 37) Angad killed one in the waterless tract, south of the Vindhya (IV 48 17 21) Sampati witnessed their struggle with the Devas (IV 58 13) Demizens of the Patāla (V 1 90) Defenders of a dharma (VI 35 13) Went into raptures when Hanu mān slipped Ravana (VI 59 62) Fell into raptures when being struck by Hanumān, Rāvaṇa dropped down senseless (VI 59 116) Wished victory to Rāvaṇa (VI 102 43) Ran to Brahman when Vayu stopped blowing (VII 31 53) When Śatrughna took out the divine arrow to kill Lavaṇa (VII 69 16 17) greatly perturbed, approached Brahman (VII 69 20 21)

ASOKA RAJAS*—Son of Kāśyapa and Vaidarbhi धर्मिष्ठ सत्यवादि At the desire of his father founded the town of Dharmāraṇya महामति (I 32 17)

AHALYĀ—Wife of Gautama, with whom she practised austerities for many years near Mithilā (I. 48. 16). Violated by Indra (I. 48. 17-19). Out of fear asked Indra to leave the cottage without delay (I. 48. 20-22). सुश्रोणी, सुमध्यमा—cursed by Gautama to pine in that hermitage for 100 years till relieved by Rāma (I. 48. 29-32). दुर्वृत्ता, दुष्टचारिणी (I. 48. 32-33). Seen by Rāma bright with the lustre of austerities, महाभागा, प्रयत्नान्निर्मिता धात्रा, दिव्या मायामयीव, like smoking fire, a fullmoon enveloped in snow, like a ray of the sun, reflected in water (I. 49. 13-15). Became visible to all on the expiation of her sin (I. 49. 16). Received Rāma and Lakṣmana hospitably (I. 49. 17-18). Honored by the Devas when reconciled to Gautama (I. 49. 20). देवरूपिणी (I. 49. 11). Created as the Perfect Being by Brahman, transferred to Gautama as a trust, and then bestowed in marriage (VII. 30. 19-27). Her violation and consequent emancipation with the help of Rāma recalled by Brahman (VII. 30. 28-46).

VII—NOTES AND QUTRIES

By GOPINATH KAVIRAJ

(1)—Virgin Worship.

The Mahākālasambhita says that the best way of propitiating Śiva is to worship a virgin (कुमारी) and to feed her. The Kaulas are to worship her in the night and the Smārtas in afternoon. The virgin should be well bathed, well draped in a piece of multi coloured cloth and well decorated. She must be one whose heart has not yet been even touched with passion and who has not fallen into love. She must be of 7, 8 or 9 years of age, of fair complexion, of noble birth, and with her parents living. She must not be deformed in body, long haired, with protruding teeth, or betrothed to any body (पाग्दत्ता).

In the Yamala a virgin is said to be of 3 kinds, viz parā, aparā and parāparī. The Virgin was the Sole Existence before the Creation of the Universe and is therefore known by the name of आद्याशक्ति or Primal Energy (आद्या)

Names of the virgin from the 1st to the 16th year are as given below—Sandhyā, Sarasvatī, Tridhīmurti, Kālikā, Subhagā, Umā, Mālinī, Kābyākā, Kālā Samgharshā, Aparājitā, Rudrāptī, Bhāravī, Mahālakṣmī, Kulānyakā, Kṣetrajñī and Chandīkā

As for the mode of her worship the Mahākālasambhita says that the virgin is to be conducted respectfully with music and entertainments to the door of the hall of worship. The number of virgins to be worshipped must be an odd number, either 5 or 7 or 9 or even 11. Of these the fairest one is to be considered as the Primary (मुख्य) One, but if many maidens

are not available one will do. In Kāmya and Namittika pujas only one is needed, while in the autumnal worship a large number is a necessity. They are to be kept standing in a row, with their eyes cast down. The worshipper is to regard the **मुख्या** as identical with the Goddess herself, take up a cup of wine, and go through the process of pranayāma, bhūtapasāraṇa (expulsion of evil spirits), obeisance to Guru and Gaṇeśa, and Dighāndhana. He is then to wash her feet, place the water on his head and rub her feet with the corner of his own wearing garment. With unbroken rice (अक्षत) he should then perform the ceremony for removing the obstacles (विघ्नोत्सारण). The ceremonies for expelling the evil influences (भूतापसारण and विघ्नोत्सारण) have to be performed once again, the reason being that many minor gods and goddesses enter the hall of worship together with the Virgin Goddess to see her, and very often they create disturbances. The worshipper has to take with his left hand the right hand of the maiden, step forth with his right foot planted first on the ground and lead the line of the maidens on into the hall uttering 5 verses in her praise
स्वमग्न्य जगतामाद्ये जगदाधाररूपिणि &c

The worship of the **मुख्या** is enough to please the rest. This is followed by an act of offering to the minor gods. Then follows Kumārīpūjā. The names of the 18 maidens and their respective seats in the body. Mahāchandra Yogesvari, Siddhikarāl, Siddhivikarāl, Mahantamari (?), Vajrakapālī, Mundamahī, Aṭṭahasī, Chāṇḍakapālī, Kālachakreśvari, Guhyakāl, Kūṭyayāni, Kamakhya, Chāmonḍā, Siddhilakṣmī, Kubjika, Mātangi, Chāṇḍesvari and Kaumārī. Their respective seats head (शिर) face (मुख), eyes, ears, nostrils, cheek, lines of teeth shoulders, heart, arms belly (उदर) back thighs, knees, hips (जङ्घा), legs and the entire frame.

The worships of 9 goddesses-viz Suddhā, Kālikā, Lalitā, Mālīni, Vasundharā, Sarasvatī, Rāmā, Gaurī and Durgā-and of two gods viz Bāṭukā, a boy of 5 years, and Gaṇeśa, of 9 years,-are enjoined. So also of 8 Bhairavas viz Asitāṅga Bhairava, Ruru°, Chaṇḍa°, Krodha°, Unmatta°, Kapāl°, Bhīṣaṇa° and Saṃhara° and of 8 Devis viz Mahāmāyā, Kālarātri, Sarvamangalā, Damarukā, Rājarājesvari, Sampat-pradā, Bhāṇavati and Kumārī. The 6 Śaktis attendant on the Devis are named Ananga Kusumā, °Manmathā, °Madanā, °Kusumāturā, °Madanaturā and °Śīsurā.

The worship of the मुर्या being over, the remaining maidens should next be attended to. They should be allowed to eat of the food offered up to them in silence. No sound of any instrument should be made to disturb them at their meals. The worshipper with folded hands should sing in their praise a hymn called कुमारीस्तोत्र (16 verses in anuṣṭup metre, from the Mahākālā Samhitā). After they have taken their food they should be served with betels in due form. This is followed by the offering of dakṣiṇā, and finally the ceremony of Visarjana.

The leavings of their dishes should be given to jackals or buried in the earth.

The worship of the Virgin is recommended during the Navarātra festival for 9 days in succession. The names of the 9 Durgas to be worshipped on the 9 days are: Hīlekṣhā, Gaganī, Raktī, Mahāchikhuṃbī, Karīṭikā, Ichchhī, Jāṭinā, Kṛpā and Durgā. Last of all we find the following remarkable expression—

यदि सा क्षेममायानि स्वयमेव विलासिनो ।
तथा नृप नरोदु रात्रिं पापान् वा निर्गोत्रयोः ॥
कुमारीं न स्पृशेद्य भाषयुक्तान् पेयसा ।
अन्यथा मृत्युमायानि नो वेदुः श्रेयो परादमुषो ॥

THE PRINCESS OF WALES SARASVATI BHAVANA TEXTS

Edited by

GOPINATH KAVIRAJ, M A

- No 1—The Kiranavali Bhaskam, a Commentary on Udayana's Kiranavali Dravya section by Padmanabha Miśra
Edited with Introduction and Index by Gopinatha Kaviraj M A
- No 2—The Advaita Chintamani by Rangoji Bhaṭṭa, Ed with Introduction etc by Narayana Śāstri Kṛṣṇa Sāhityacharya
- No 3—The Vedānta Kalpalatā by Madhusudana Sarasvati Ed. with Introduction etc by Ramajñā Pīṇḍeya Vyākaraṇacharya
- No 4—The Kusumajyoti Bodhan a Commentary on Udayana's Theistic Tract Nyāyakuṣumajyoti by Varadaraja Ed with Introduction etc by Gopinath Kaviraj, M A
- No 5—The Rasasūtra a Commentary on Udayana's Kiranavali, Guna Section, by Bhaṭṭa Vāchandra Ed with Introduction etc by Gopinath Kaviraj M A
- No 6 (Part I)—The Bhavana Vākyā by Mandana Miśra, with a Commentary by Bhaṭṭa Umbela Ed with Introduction etc by M M Gangannātha Jb5, M A, D Litt
- No 6 (Part II)—Ditto Ditto
- No 7 (Part I)—Yoginīhrdaya dīpikā by Amṛtananda Natha, being a Commentary on Yoginīhrdaya a part of Yamakesvara Tāttva Ed with Introduction etc by Gopināth Kaviraj M A
- No 7—(Part II) Ditto Ditto
- No 8—The Kavyajñāni by Gaṅgananda Kavindra Ed with Introduction etc by Jagannātha Śāstri Hoṣhūr, Sahityopālīnaya
- No 9 (Part I)—The Bhakti Chandrika a Commentary on Śrīdhara's Bhaktisūtras by Narayana Tīrtha Ed with a Prefatory Note by Gopināth Kaviraj M A

- No. 10(Part I)—The Siddhāntaratna by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. Ed. with a Prefatory Note by Gopināth Kavirāj, M. A.
- No. 10—(Part II) Ditto Ditto
- No. 11—The Śrī Vidyā Ratna Sūtras, by Gauḍapāda, with a Commentary by Śaṅkararāyaṇa.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Nārāyaṇa Śāstri Khiste Sāhityāchārya.
- No. 12—The Rasapradīpa, by Prabhākara Bhaṭṭa
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Nārāyaṇa Śāstri Khiste Sāhityāchārya.
- No. 13—The Siddhasiddhānta Saṅgraha, by Balabhadra.
Ed. with Introduction by Gopināth Kavirāj, M. A.
- No. 14—The Triveṇikā, by Āśādhara Bhaṭṭa.
Ed. with Introduction by Batukanāth Śarma Sāhityopādhyāy., M. A. and Jagannātha Śāstri Hoshing Sāhityopādhyāya
- No. 15—(Part I)—The Tripurārahasya.
Ed. with a Prefatory Note by Gopināth Kavirāj, M.A.
- No. 15—(Part II) Ditto Ditto
- No. 16—The Kāvya Vilāsa, by Chirañjīva Bhaṭṭāchārya.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Batukanātha Śarma Sāhityopādhyāya, M. A. and Jagannātha Śāstri Hoshing Sāhityopādhyāya.
- No. 17—The Nyāya Kahka, by Bhaṭṭa Jayanta.
Ed. with Introduction by M. M. Gaṅgānātha Jhā,
M. A., D. Litt.
- No. 18 (Part I)—The Gorakṣa Siddhānta Saṅgraha.
Ed. with a Prefatory Note by Gopināth Kavirāj, M.A.
- No. 19 (Part I)—The Prakṛta Prakāśa by Vamaruchi with the Prakṛta Saṁjvani by Vasantarāja and the Subodhina by Sudānanda
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Batuk Nath Śarma, M. A. and Baladeva Upādhyāya, M.A.
- No. 19 (Part II)—
- No. 20—The Maṇṣatattvaviveka by Viśvanātha Nyāya-
pañchārāṇa Ed. with Introduction by Jagannātha Śāstri Hoshing.

- No 21-(Part I) The Nyāya Siddhānta Mālā, by Jayarāma
Nyayapañchanana Bhattachārya
Ed with Introduction etc by Mangala Deva
Sastri, M A, D Phil
- No 22-The Dharmānubandhi Śloka Chaturdaśī, by Śrī Śeṣa
Kṛṣṇa, with a Com by Rīma Pandit
Ed with Introduction etc. by Nārāyaṇa
Śāstri Khiste Sāhityācharya
- No 23-Navaratna pradīpa, by Nanda Pandit Dharmādbhikṣu
Ed with Introduction etc by Vajjanātha
Sastri Vrakale Dharmasastra Sastri
- No 24-Śrī Rīma tāpiniyopaniṣad with the Com called
Rāma Kāśikā in Purvatāpini and Ānandānubhī
in Uttarātāpini by Ānanda Vana
Ed with Introduction etc by Anantārāma
Śāstri Vetāla Sahityopādhyāya
- No 25-Sāpindya Kalpalatākā by Sadāśiva Deva alias Āpadeva
with the Com of Nārāyaṇa Deva
Ed. with Introduction etc by Jagannātha
Śāstri Hoshing Sahityopādhyāya

THE PRINCESS OF WALES SARASVATI BHAVANA STUDIES

Edited by

GOPINATH KAVIRAJ, M A

Vol. I—

- (a) Studies in Hindu Law (1) its evolution, by Gaṅgānātha Jhā
- (b) The View point of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Philosophy, by Gopinath Kaviraj
- (c) Nirmāna Kāya, by Gopinath Kaviraj

Vol II—

- (a) Paraśurāma Miśra ALIAS Vānī Rasāla Rāya, by Gopināth Kavirāj
- (b) Index to Śabara's Bhāṣya, by the late Col. G A. Jacob.
- (c) Studies in Hindu Law (2) —its sources, by Gaṅganāth Jha
- (d) A new Bhakti Sūtra, by Gopināth Kaviraj
- (e) The System of Chakras according to Gorakṣanātha, by Gopināth Kaviraj
- (f) Theism in Ancient India, by Gopināth Kavirāj
- (g) Hindu Poetics, by Bāṭuka Nātha Śarmā
- (h) A seventeenth Century Astrolabe, by Padmākara Dvivedi
- (i) Some aspects of Vira Śaiva Philosophy, by Gopināth Kaviraj
- (j) Nyāya Kusumāñjali (English Translation), by Gopināth Kavirāj
- (k) The Definition of Poetry, by Narāyaṇa Śastri Khiste
- (l) Sondala Upādhyāya, by Gopināth Kaviraj

Vol. III—

- (a) Index to Śabara's Bhāṣya by the late Col. G A. Jacob
- (b) Studies in Hindu Law (3) Judicial Procedure, by Gaṅgānāth Jha.
- (c) Theism in Ancient India, by Gopināth Kaviraj
- (d) History and Bibliography of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Literature, by Gopinath Kaviraj
- (e) Narsadha and Śrī Hara by Nilakamala Bhaṭṭachārya,
- (f) Indian Dramaturgy, by P N Pāṇḍekar

Vol. IV—

- (a) Studies in Hindu Law (4) Judicial Procedure by Gaṅganātha Jhā

- (b) History and Bibliography of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Literature, by Gopināth Kaviraj
- (c) Analysis of the Contents of the Rgveda Pratiśakṛtya, by Mangala Deva Śastri
- (d) Nārāyaṇa's Gaṇita Kaumudī by Padmakara Dvivedī
- (e) Food and Drink in the Rāmāyaṇic Age, by Manmatha Nath Ray
- (f) Satkaryavada Causality in Sankhya, by Gopinath Kaviraj
- (g) Discipline by Consequences, by G L Sinha
- (h) History of the origin and expansion of the Aryans, by A C Ganguly
- (i) Punishments in Ancient Indian Schools by G L Sinha

Vol V—

- (a) Ancient Home of the Aryans and their migration to India, by Atul Chandra Ganguly
- (b) A Satrap Coin, by Shyam Lal Mehr
- (c) An Estimate of the civilisation of the Vanaras as depicted in the Rāmāyaṇa, by Manmatha Nath Ray
- (d) A Comparison of the contents of the Rgveda, Vājasaneyī, Taittirīya—, and Atharvaveda—(Caturadhyāyikā) Prātiśakṛtyas, by Mangal Deva Śastri
- (e) Doctrine of Formal Training and the Ancient Indian Thought, by G L Sinha.
- (f) History and Bibliography of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Literature, by Gopi Nath Kaviraj
- (g) An Index to the proper names occurring in Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa, by Manmatha Nath Ray
- (h) Notes and Queries, by Gopinath Kaviraj

Vol VI—(In progress)

- (a) Index to Śaṅkara's Bhāṣya by the late Col G A Jacob
- (b) Some aspects of the History and Doctrines of the Nāthas, by Gopinath Kaviraj
- (c) An Index to the proper names occurring in Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa, by Manmatha Nath Ray
- (d) Studies in Hindu Law (5) Evidence, by Gaṅgānātha Jhī

To be had of—

- (1) The Superintendent, Govt Press, Allahabad
- (2) Messrs Braj Bhushan Das & Co., Thakari Bazar, Benares City
- (3) Babu Jaya Krishna Das Gupta, Chowkhamba Book Depot, Benares City